Longan, George W., 1819-1891.
Origin of the Disciples of Christ

3346

286.6 #32 3346

Nebraska Christian College Library

Courtesy of

286.6

Theology of the gospel p. 74.
Our influence upon Baptists 75.
Spirit of Campbell's writings 79

Influence of Declaration & Address on N.C. 93
Apostolic Confession Faith Chapter V

Acc mistake p 175

Our relation to AC 177
Spirit of whitetts line AC 175

J. B. Higbee,
Waco, Texas.

ORIGIN

OF THE

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

A REVIEW OF PROF. W H. WHITSITT'S VOLUME ENTITLED "ORIGIN OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST."

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CLEARER UNDERSTANDING OF THE ORIGIN AND PRINCIPLES OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION INAUGURATED BY THOMAS AND ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, NEAR THE BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT CENTURY.

By GEORGE W. LONGAN,
MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

TO WHICH IS ADDED AN APPENDIX CONTAINING EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS OF PROF. WHITSITT'S BOOK BY BAPTIST WRITERS.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY J. H. GARRISON,
EDITOR CHRISTIAN-EVANGELIST.

ST. LOUIS:
CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.
1889.

Copyrighted, 1889,
BY
CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING CO.

BX
7321
.L66
1889

TO THE MEMORY OF

Augustin Knight Longan

and

Martha Letchworth Longan,

MY HONORED FATHER AND MOTHER,

Who were Baptists without being bigots, and joyfully received truth, as God gave them to see it, in their day and generation, this little volume is most affectionately inscribed by

THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION.

It has been said that a grain of wheat or barley, found in the sarcophagus of an Egyptian mummy, where it had lain dormant many long centuries, when placed in the earth, germinated, grew, and multiplied itself many fold. Whether this incident be true or not it is certain that many seeds are covered with a flinty case or envelop which protects them in a dormant state for years, until they are surrounded by favorable conditions, when they awaken to life and develop all their germinal potentiality. The history of the world's progress shows that this is pre-eminently true of those seed-thoughts which, from age to age, have been sown in the minds of men, and whose ultimate harvests have furnished bread for the world's hunger. Truth is the most indestructible of all potencies. The men who speak it may indeed pay the penalty of their lives for its utterance, but the truth they utter lives on to guide the course of history.

"Truth forever on the scaffold;
Wrong forever on the throne;
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
For behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow,
Keeping watch above his own."

"It was during the fiercest dogmatic controversies and the horrors of the Thirty Years' War," says Dr. Philip Schaff, in his Ecclesiastical History (Vol. VI., page 650), "that a prophetic voice whispered to future generations the watchword of Christian peace-makers, which was unheeded in a century of intolerance, and forgotten in a century of indifference, but resounds with increased force in a century of revival and reunion: 'IN ESSENTIALS Unity, in NON-ESSENTIALS Liberty, in all things Charity.'"

This famous saying, sometimes referred to St. Augustine,

and oftener to Richard Baxter, who quotes it, is traced by Dr. Schaff to Rupertus Meldenius, an otherwise unknown divine and author of a remarkable tract, in which the sentence occurs. This tract, it is believed, appeared in the year 1627 or 1628. Fifty years later, however, Baxter quotes it, from another author in the preface to his work on "The True and only way of Concord of all the Christian Churches." And now, in the latter part of the 19th century, two hundred years later, I am quoting this same great truth in the Introduction to another work, which, I have no doubt, offers a far better solution of "the true and only way of concord of all the Christian churches!"

Here, then, is an admirable illustration of the indestructible vitality of an important truth, which not only persists in living through centuries of opposition and neglect, but which manifests increased power over each succeeding generation. How few there were to recognize in this statement the germ of a great religious reformation, when it was first formulated and uttered by Meldenius! In Baxter's day it attracted more attention as offering relief from the interminable strifes and divisions with which all pious, truth-loving souls were weary. But it was not until more than a century later that it gained practical recognition in an organized movement having for its end the unity and peace of the church.

Indeed, it is quite certain that neither Meldenius nor Baxter perceived all that was involved in this memorable motto. What they did see, evidently, was an utter lack of discrimination, in the popular mind, between the things which are vital and those which are incidental, and the consequent effort to enforce uniformity at the expense of unity. As a remedy for this state of things they proposed the foregoing statement which had in it the seed of a reformation yet to be. But the seed must wait for genial soil and favorable surroundings. If either of the men named, or any of the theologians of that period who accepted this motto, had been asked to state more specifically what were the "things essential," and what the "things indifferent," their answer, doubtless, would have borne the marks and the limitations of the religious thought of their times. It was for another age to develop, more clearly

than was possible at that time, the right application of this principle to the religious problems upon which Christendom had divided into hostile camps.

In the early part of the present century, Thomas Campbell, looking at the same evils which Meldenius, Baxter and others had seen and deplored, uttered a not less remarkable saying in the memorable words which he made the battle cry of reform: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak, and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent." The clear import of this striking motto was, What is enjoined upon men by divine authority we shall insist on being observed; and where the word of God has left men free, we shall not bind them. The phrase, "things essential," had now been interpreted to mean, *the things required by the Scriptures*, and the "things indifferent" were those where the *silence* of the Scriptures left men free to follow their best judgment. In both these mottoes there is a clear recognition of divine authority, and an equally distinct rejection of human authority in matters of religious faith and practice. In each of them there is a solemn emphasis of loyalty to God, on the one hand, and of freedom from the tyranny of opinion, on the other. But "where the Scriptures speak" is a decided advance, in the direction of clearness and definiteness, beyond the "things essential."

In the progress of the Reformation as urged by the Campbells and their co-laborers, another distinction of great value came into vogue. The "things essential" of this 17th century motto, and the things enjoined by the Scriptures, were called *matters of faith*, while inferences on matters where the Scriptures are "silent,"—the "things indifferent"—were called *matters of opinion*. This distinction between faith and opinion —the one resting on divine authority, the other on men's fallible judgment—served to clear away a good deal of fog from the religious atmosphere, and to enable men to go forward in the work of reform with a firmer step. It was now seen that a great many things which properly belonged to the category of inferential knowledge, and might be classified as such, representing the results of Biblical investigation, could never be classified as belonging to the *things of faith*, or have any legitimate place in a creed or confession of faith. It was the clear

perception of this distinction that led our reformatory fathers to reject, *as bonds of union and communion*, all human creeds and confessions of faith. It was not that these creeds contained errors, though doubtless they did, being the results of fallible human thought, but that they contained matter which, whether true or false, had no business in a *creed* or confession of *faith*, to serve as a basis of fellowship among Christians. If true, they belong to the category of inferential *knowledge*, not of faith. If they suggested wise methods of organization, work or worship, they belonged to the "things indifferent," and not to "things essential."

In the historical evolution of this reformatory principle, there was yet another step taken, which was essential to the application of this venerable motto to the religious questions of the age, and necessary to bring the reformers clearly on to New Testament ground. It was soon perceived in the light of New Testament teaching, that the faith which the gospel requires—the truly evangelical faith—was faith in Jesus of Nazareth, as the Christ, the Son of the living God. It was not faith in dogmas, propositions, or ordinances, but in a *Savior*, that constitutes saving faith. To believe in *him*, and to obey his commandments *because* we believe in him—these, now, it was seen, were the "essential things," in which there must be "unity." Other matters, not contravening these, were the "things indifferent," concerning which there must be "liberty." How significant, now, the saying of Paul, "There is one faith!" Many *opinions* there may be, but there is only one *faith*, having for its object the one Lord. Here, at last, was perspicuity itself. The magnificent generalization, coined by Meldenius and adopted by Baxter, when illumined thus by the light of the New Testament, became an operative principle. Only men were now needed with the courage of their convictions, to test this principle in the practical work of reform. The men were not wanting. They did test it; and with what results the world knows.

The origin and development of a great religious movement, which, in less than three quarters of a century has gathered together in one body, from the world and from all the discordant sects of Christendom, more than three quarters of a mil-

lion of adherents, who, without other bond of union or basis of fellowship than that possessed by the primitive church, maintain unity in things essential without restricting liberty in things indifferent, is a subject that might well engage the careful thought and the impartial treatment of the student of church history and of religious progress. The book of which this volume is a review, seeks the origin of this movement in certain accidental or incidental ecclesiastical relations, or fortuitous contact of individuals by which strange and peculiar notions and practices were transmitted through the leaders of the movement and embodied in what is termed the current reformation. This volume, on the contrary, with a truer historic insight, sees in this religious movement the orderly development and timely embodiment of great fundamental truths, which, taking their source in the very nature and organic life of the Christian institution, have, after centuries of slight and neglect, found more or less perfect expression in the utterances of men who lived ahead of their time, until in the fulness of time, in a freer age and in a freer land, they have found opportunity for manifesting their divine potency. It is more than a reply to the warped opinions and far-fetched inferences of Prof. Whitsitt. It is a broad, scholarly, dignified discussion of the underlying *principles* of our movement, which, without following in detail the animadversions of the book it reviews, none the less effectually removes the foundation from beneath it. The author evidently feels that no mechanical theory about "offshoots" or imaginary similarities between our movement and some supposed heresy of former times can harm us, so long as it can be shown that we build on the same foundation on which the apostles built, and hold fast to those principles which have made Christianity the conquering power that it has been in the world.

That this volume will contribute to a clearer understanding of the fundamental law—the *raison d'etre*—of our movement on the part of all who read it thoughtfully, I cannot doubt. That it may, also, serve to hasten that unity for which our Lord prayed, I fain would hope and pray.

St. Louis, April 1, 1889. J. H. GARRISON.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

INTRODUCTION - - - - - 5

CHAPTER I.

Preliminary - - - - - - 11

CHAPTER II.

A Brief Inquiry into the Nature of "Off-shoots" - 17

CHAPTER III.

An Historical Sketch - - - - 33

CHAPTER IV.

The Simple Facts of the Case - - - 66

CHAPTER V.

A Most Fundamental Difference - - - 106

CHAPTER VI.

Certain Matters of Detail - - - - 119

CHAPTER VII.

The Baptists - - - - - 148

CHAPTER VIII.

The Relation of the Disciples of Christ to Alexander Campbell and Other Leaders - - 166

APPENDIX - - - - - - 183

Origin of the Disciples of Christ.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY.

There are Baptists and Baptists. That is to say, there are Baptists who are large-minded, Christian men; there are others that are narrow, illiberal, bigoted: genuine old time Pharisees, as it were, only dipped and newly named. Those of the one class are gratified to see differences disappearing, old animosities gradually dying out, and more fraternal relations growing up between themselves and other disciples of the Lord. The rest are, apparently, never quite so happy as when stirring up old strifes, fanning the fires of party hate, and making men imagine themselves enemies who ought, long ago, to have seen clearly that they are brethren in Christ. With those of the former class, it is our duty and pleasure to cultivate brotherly love and mutual respect; as for the other sort, it is sufficient, if we sincerely pray that their eyes may be opened, and patiently bide the Lord's time for the answer to our prayers.

"The Origin of the Disciples?" That should be an interesting inquiry. Of course, the surface facts

are common property. Disciples and Baptists are alike familiar with them. But there is a deeper question, one which the philosophers of a later generation are certain to deal with, and which it is to be hoped they will be better able to answer, than are the jaundice-eyed sectarians of the present time. This is a day when men are looking after *origins* with an interest which was never felt before. The birth of worlds, the beginning of life, the derivation of species, the differentiation of social structures and functions, in the ever-increasing complexity of civilized life, the evolutions of thought, the castaway blunders, the survival of tested hypotheses, which have marked the progress of human knowledge from the dawn of the historical period, to the present year of grace,—these are the questions concerning which the thinkers of our time consider it worth while to employ their highest powers. In such a period, the *origin* and development of a movement which clearly contains within it the "promise and potency" of most wonderful achievements for God and our fellow-men may well challenge the attention of honest inquirers after enduring reality. This search after *origins* is a most fascinating pursuit. There is nothing like it. And whether it relates to the processes by which the insignificant tadpole gets rid of its tail and gills, and acquires legs and lungs, a phenomenon occurring every year before our eyes, or that more ancient transformation, in which the

land-lubber whale of the elder æons became—not exactly a fish, for that he is not—but monarch of the seas, for all the historical ages, it makes no difference at all. It is in any case a question of *origin*, and, as such, it has that nameless fascination, which you are not able to explain, but which, nevertheless, excites an interest that nothing else in the wide field of human investigation is able to arouse within you. The *origin* of the Disciples! That is the question now. Prof. Whitsitt has been rummaging the theological records of the eighteenth century, and has found, or thinks he has found, in those far away times, traces of an obscure sect, which presents homologous characteristics with those which he says distinguish the Disciples at present, or did distinguish them a generation or two ago, and, straightway, he springs to the conclusion that here is a clear case of genetic development. "The Disciples are an offshoot from the Sandemanians." This is their *origin*. This explains why they are here, and also how they came to be here!! Then the Sandemanians were adjudged great heretics by some people in their day, and therefore the Disciples of Christ must be heretics too. So the case seems fairly made out, and, doubtless, the achievement will be adjudged of sufficient importance to warrant the addition of other titular honors to those which our learned Professor displays in connection with his name on the title-page of his small, but somewhat pretentious book.

But really, now we come to think of it, what does this matter of ancestral lineage amount to after all? Even if the case were confessedly clear that the Disciples came from the Sandemanians, would that fact make them either better or worse? The question of genetic descent is doubtless one of great philosophic interest, but what has it to do with the status of any man, or any community of men, now living? Should the Anglo-American of to-day concern himself greatly in regard to the proportion of Saxon, Angle or Jute blood that courses in his veins? Is he either better or worse for any possible combination of these ancient elements? Or, considering the question from the ecclesiastical standpoint, are any of us better or worse because our ancestors, a few generations back, were Roman Catholics? Or, if in making their way out of spiritual Babylon, our forefathers have struggled along this or that dimly lighted pathway, what does it signify? A man's grandfather was, let us say, a Presbyterian, but he is, himself, a Baptist. His great grand-father was a Roman Catholic. The question of his descent, genetically, either by blood or ecclesiastic affiliation, is of no practical significance. The interest which attaches to such a question is purely scientific or philosophical. The important matter is not that of descent, but of *ascent*. Have the generations through which he counts his lineage been going up or down? Does he represent, in his own person, a lower or higher altitude? This is the

only question worth a groat, when we are dealing with the claims of a religious community. I may be greatly interested in tracing the interactions of the human mind with its social or ecclesiastical environment through many centuries, in noting how, and when, it has disengaged itself from this false speculation, or that rank superstition, and emerged into a clearer and better intellectual atmosphere; or perchance I may note periods of decadence, of reactionary tendencies, when the wheels of progress have been reversed, and the mind has gone backward, instead of forward to its divinely predestined goal. In point of fact I am greatly interested with such studies. But I hope to be always able to distinguish between the scientific interest of such an inquiry and that of the moral and spiritual significance of its final outcome. What we are to-day, is everything; what our forefathers, in any sense, were a hundred or five hundred years ago, is nothing. How the race began, along what physiological or biological lines it may be compelled to trace its progress when science has uttered its final word, does not affect at all the question of man's rank and dignity at the present time. My thoughts about Christ, about the gospel of Christ, are neither sound or unsound on account of the traceable interactions of a thousand generations through which they have been shaping themselves into their present form. The Disciples of Christ are to be judged by their faith and life to-day, just as Bap-

tists are, and not by any real or imaginary connection with generations dead and gone. And this I say without conceding any value whatever to Prof. Whitsitt's assumption of a genetic relationship between the Disciples and the Sandemanians of more than a hundred years ago. If his case were made out, it is nothing; but it is not made out.

Why a Baptist, of all the men in the world, should start this question of lineage is scarcely clear. There is no denominational appellative more indefinite than Baptist. Why, how many sorts of Baptists are there, any way? Let us see. There are, or there have been, Regular Baptists, Separate Baptists, Calvinistic Baptists and Armenian Baptists; Seventh Day Baptists and Six Principle Baptists; Baptists that were for sending missionaries to the heathen, and Baptists that were opposed to sending missionaries to anybody. I need not further specify. Prof. Whitsitt knows them all. I make no comment. Only I remark, in passing, that, in view of these facts, I fail to see why a Baptist Professor should concern himself greatly about questions of ecclesiastic origin.

CHAPTER II.

A BRIEF INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF "OFFSHOOTS."

No great movement of any kind ever owed its origin to a single individual. When we speak of the beginning of the Reformation of the 16th century, we designate it the Lutheran Reformation on account of Luther's great prominence in its inception and early progress. But when we say "The Lutheran Reformation," if we are not lamentably ignorant of its history, we mean no more than the assignment of due precedence to the most distinguished among a great number of able, and equally faithful, men. And if we should imagine that there were no influences at work, no deeply felt dissatisfaction with the existing order of things, no strong intellectual and moral tendencies slowly shaping themselves for future effect, before Luther appeared on the scene, we would betray very gross ignorance of some of the most significant facts of history. The seeds of Protestant truth were already germinating in many hearts, when the monk of Erfurt began his remarkable career as a reformer. The Catholic Stawpitz, who said to Luther, vainly seeking peace through the intercession of saints, and the holy virgin, "You would be a painted sinner, and have a painted Christ as a Savior,"

was already, though unconsciously, much more than half a Protestant. And how much, for good or ill, did Luther owe to Augustine, the greatest of the Latin fathers? It was Luther himself who said, "Next after the Holy Scriptures, no teacher in the church is to be compared with Augustine; take the entire body of the fathers together, there is not to be found in them half that we find in Augustine alone." We may differ from him in this estimate. The subtle but profound insight of the earlier Grecian school at Alexandria was clearly underrated by him. But the point I press is Luther's indebtedness to others, and the fact of pre-existing tendencies, which shaped his thought, and determined the mighty work of his life. The greatest men that have ever lived have been made what they were, in large part, at least, by the outward conditions—providential, let us devoutly say—which surrounded them in the youthful and plastic period of their careers. It was, I believe, the thoughtful and brilliant Frenchman, M. Taine, who said that the "Protestant movement" (I quote the meaning, not the precise words) "would have been impossible at the time, in any other country of Europe than Germany." *A great movement in the world's living thought must have an adequate preparation.* Next to Germany, England was the best field for Protestant missionary effort. Wycliffe, "The Morning-star of the Reformation," and Tyndale, the translator and martyr, did not live

and suffer in vain. M. Taine well say "that England was more than half Protestant when Henry VIII. found himself driven to separation from Rome." Not by any means the least interesting feature in Dr. Neander's great history of the church is the scholarly and pains-taking minuteness with which he traces the evolution of ideas, disclosing thereby the hidden forces by which all important changes in the exterior course of things had been gradually wrought out. Uniformitarianism is the law of human history, no less than that of the planet on which we live. That there have been exceptional periods, periods of relatively great and rapid changes, is in no sense contrary to the general fact. He has been a very superficial student of mundane events who has not made this discovery, and learned to apply it discriminatingly in dealing with the history of particular periods, or tracing the inception and progress of great and enduring movements in the thought and lives of men.

If the 18th century was not marked by any great original movement in theology, it was still a period of very considerable intellectual activity along certain lines of doctrinal speculation. The ablest minds, while fairly content with general results of the earlier creative period of the Reformation, were sedulously striving to systematize and reduce to scholastic form the essential elements of the common Protestant outline; but each one, of course, in his own way, and from his own individual point of

view. This led to many minute inquiries and hair-splitting distinctions, very much after the manner of the older scholastics, which we are apt in this more practical age to set aside as useless. Among these nice and sometimes puzzling distinctions, must be reckoned much that was said and written on the nature of faith, especially "saving faith," and precisely how this faith is related to justification, so that, although it must be conceded to be, in some sense, the act of the creature, yet the doctrine of grace is not impaired by making it the sole human ground of divine acceptance. In this special field, Glas and Sandeman, from our distant point of view, appear to have been adventurous pioneers, leading bravely out into what doubtless, seemed to them to be the most promising paths of inquiry which the researches of the fathers of Protestantism had left open to their descendants. They were keen thinkers, if not profound, and their speculations, though often unfruitful, as judged by the standard of our times, must be admitted to have been ingenious, and sometimes absolutely convincing. They did more than attract the attention of the best thinkers; they made a marked impression upon the thought of their age. But Sandemanianism, as the system came to be designated, was not limited to ingenious speculations concerning the nature of faith and justification, but embraced the more practical questions of the organization and order of the churches

in the times of the apostles, and while yet under their personal instruction and authoritative guidance.

They saw that there had been no unbroken line of continuity in the outward succession of history. Comparing the organization and order of the churches of their own time with what they read plainly in the New Testament, they saw that a very great change had taken place. There were no state churches in the beginning. And this was not simply that the secular administrations of the period were unchristian, or anti-christian. They felt that neither Christ nor the apostles would have tolerated for a moment the idea of an Established Church. With Glas, this had been the original point of departure from the beaten path of his fathers. But the Bishops and clergy, the reverend ministers of all the received orthodoxies, were quite distinct in their order and official relations from the simple and unostentatious Bishops and Evangelists of the New Testament. They insisted, therefore, upon a reconstruction in harmony with the New Testament Scriptures. In this contention the day of judgment will undoubtedly vindicate their wisdom and faithfulness, even though some men may think they were misled by an overstrained "literalism" in the attempts which they made to realize their conception of the constitution of the original churches of Christ. Why should it be thought a vicious "literalism" to adhere closely to primitive prece-

dents in the matter of organization and order, as well as in other things? Especially, one is tempted to ask, why should Baptists urge such a view as this? The Baptists, whose sole distinction almost relates to the ordinances? Are the ordinances everything, and the original order nothing? Why then do Baptists talk about their "faith and *order!*" Or is it so, that rigidness as to the subject and "mode" of Baptism must be maintained at all hazards, but that the office, and relations to the churches, of the divinely constituted Bishops, Deacons and Evangelists is judged of no importance at all? If this be so, why is it so? On what ground is rigidness demanded in one case, and any desirable laxity admitted in the other? What is the exact limit, beyond which, "literalism" in following the apostles ceases to be a virtue? Or is this the explanation—viz: that Prof. Whitsitt *thinks* the Baptists are in line with the apostles on the ordinances, and *knows* that, on the questions of organization and worship, they are to some extent out of harmony with them? This I suppose to be the true reason in spite of the sneers at an undefined "literalism" by means of which he seeks to conceal the fact in the case.

But Glas and Sandeman ran their course without accomplishing anything which could be called epoch-making in its character. They lived and died Pedobaptists, and also rigid Calvinists. It is

of the last importance that the reader should not forget these facts for a single moment. He should need nothing more to keep him from being misled in the matter now under discussion.

Prof. Whitsitt will find it impossible to make intelligent Disciples feel the least respect for his attempt to trace their origin to such an unlikely source. Nor will he be able to persuade well-informed outsiders that there is even honest plausibility in his partisan contention. What he may succeed in impressing upon certain portions of his Baptist constituency, is, indeed, another question, but one of no very great importance. Only those who have an "unction from the Holy One" are proof against the wiles of partisans, and the followers of Christ should be prepared to "endure contradiction" in the spirit of their divine Master.

After the Sandemanians, we are asked to find our ecclesiastical lineage in the Scottish Baptists —"so called." The order of progress is assumed to be; firstly, the Sandemanians; secondly, the Scotch Baptists; thirdly, "the Disciples of Christ, commonly called Campbellites." Indeed these Scottish Baptists are not really Baptists at all, but only "Sandemanians of the immersion observance." This is no doubt a very clever phrase, and we should take pleasure in giving its inventor due credit. Let us hope there is no one entitled to contest Mr. Whitsitt's claim to originality in this case. But then why not let us speak of the Bap-

tists in this country as "Congregationalists of the immersion observance," while their New England congeners are styled "Congregationalists of the aspersion observance?" Such a mode of designation would be quite as plausible, certainly, and not a particle less worthy the respect of truth-loving men. The points of agreement between Baptists and Congregationalists are quite as numerous, while those of difference are as few, as in the case of the Sandemanians and Baptists of Scotland. Nor are the differences more important in the one case than in the other. With all fair-minded people, this statement will be accepted without a moment's hesitation. And, if the Scotch Baptists were only "Sandemanians of the immersion observance," then the American Baptists are no more than Congregationalists, who have been dipped by an administrator who had himself been duly dipped *by some one else!* How far the line of dipped administrators extends backward towards the apostles, neither Prof. Whitsitt nor any other Baptist could tell, if his salvation depended upon it. There are some things that one finds it hard to treat with respectful consideration. And if any dear Baptist brother, who loves Christ and the truth more than he loves his party, should think I have written any words here in style too flippant for grave themes, let him remember that all such words are to be strictly limited to the author of this book and the bellicose class of Baptists to

which he properly belongs. As regards the Scotch Baptists, they agreed in a general sense with the Sandemanians concerning the "nature of saving faith," and they followed the New Testament, as did also the Sandemanians, both in the matter of church organization and in observing the Lord's Supper, as part of the worship on the Lord's day. If this made them Sandemanians, then I insist that the Baptists of the United States are simply English Puritans modified by local influences, and the personal idiosyncracies of their partisan leaders. If the Scotch Baptists were narrow literalists in some of their notions concerning the invariable order of worship on the Lord's day, their American cousins are quite as narrow, and scarcely less the slaves of "the letter" in restricting the Lord's Supper in their churches to those who belong to the Baptist "order," or hold membership in distinctively Baptist churches. The reproach of narrowness, or servile literalism, comes with poor grace from Baptists of the Graves and Ray school, to which the author of this book seems properly to belong.

But, still, the Disciples are "an off-shoot of the Sandemanian sect of Scotland," writes Prof. Whitsitt, with imperturbable gravity. It seems necessary to look at this affirmation more narrowly than we have hitherto done. First of all, let us ask, what, in such a connection, does the word "offshoot?" imply? It may be well to let Noah

Webster answer this question. His definition is exceedingly clear:

"Offshoot, n. (From *off* and *shoot*.) That which shoots off or separates from a main stem or channel; as the *offshoots* of a tree: 'The *offshoots* of the Gulf stream.' J. D. Forbes."

This can not be improved upon by lexicographic skill. It is perfect on the very surface. But in the light of it, let us look at Prof. Whitsitt's historical dictum. Were the Disciples ever connected with the Sandemanian sect, or any branch of such sect? Never, never! Thomas and Alexander Campbell were in the beginning, Presbyterians of the very strictest persuasion, nor had they departed widely from their ancestral traditions up to the day of their immersion by a regularly ordained Baptist preacher. Some time after that event, the church of which they were members was formally received into the fellowship of the Redstone association of Baptists, within the geographical limits of which it was located. As a simple matter of historical fact, they remained in connection with the Baptist people as long as they were permitted to do so. Touching the cause of their separation, I need say nothing here. But I may be allowed to say, in passing, that the founding of a distinct people was no part of their plan. They did not judge it desirable, however calmly they accepted the inevitable, when it came. They wanted no new order. There were divisions

enough already. They deprecated what might seem to the world like the formation of a new sect. Their whole end and purpose was anti-sectarian from the very beginning. They may not have been always wise, for that is not given to men in the flesh. But of their general soundness of judgment on New Testament questions, and their honest intent to serve the great interests of truth and righteousness, there is no reason to doubt. If men will be just, not partisan, to this conclusion must they come at last. There have indeed been large-minded Baptists, in later times (perhaps not many, but still some), who have thought that a satisfactory *modus vivendi* was not impossible, and that with a more generous toleration on the part of the Baptists than was common in those days, there need have been no division at all. Upon these questions I need not enter. They matter nothing, here or there, in the present investigation. Nor do the Disciples make any complaint to-day, however it may have been when the ties of love and fellowship were being rudely sundered by what they then regarded as a most unchristian intolerance. Our fathers accepted the situation, because they could not help themselves, albeit unwillingly, and we now regard it as having been Providential. We shall perform our much-needed work in the world, under God, far more effectively than we could have done, in the face of obstructive tactics, in any ecclesiastical connection with the

Baptists. The day is sure to come when it will be otherwise; but it is scarcely here yet. God grant it may not be far distant. But if the chronicles of those tumultuous times have correctly reached us, our fathers, as I have said, did not go out of their own accord. They would fain have suffered much, rather than cut loose from dear fellowships in Christ, and set adrift from their old ecclesiastical moorings. They did not *shoot off* at all; they were *driven off*. True, the Mahoning association, to which the Campbells belonged, when the separation was actually taking place, may be said to have gone bodily into the reform movement. But it had been a regular Baptist association. This is not disputed. Nor was any considerable section of the Disciples ever in connection with the Sandemanians. Individuals doubtless came into the movement from Sandemanian congregations, as there were those who came into it from all denominations, Catholic and Protestant. Leaders among the Scotch Baptists, and Scotch Baptist churches, whether in the old world or new, would more naturally seek fellowship and association with the Disciples than with their American cousins of the Baptist name, whenever they could be persuaded to surrender the straight-laced Calvinism in which they had been reared, because, in the matter of organization and worship, they were sure of a more sympathetic reception. Doubtless such affiliations took place, not

unfrequently, in the earlier years of our history as a distinct people. But as a mere matter of fact, the Disciples were never in ecclesiastic connection with any Sandemanian party, and could not possibly, therefore, have *shot off* from "the Sandemanian sect."

The truth is, we are not an offshoot at all. As a people in mutual fellowship, we have been gathered from all quarters of the great Babel of modern sect-dom by the acceptance of the most catholic and Christian basis of fellowship that the world has known since the rise of the original apostasy. We feel ourselves able to make this affirmation good in any forum, and in the face of any foe. But of this even we do not boast. We have nothing that we have not received from God, and to him we give the glory. Paul is nothing, Apollos is nothing, God, the giver of all good, is alone entitled to the praise. We are not an "offshoot" from any sect. The Campbells came to our present ground from the Presbyterians, by way of the Baptists. B. W. Stone, and hosts of others, came from the Presbyterians, through the "old Christian" movement. John T. Johnson, John Smith, (and there has only been one John Smith after all), the Mortons, Creaths, and multitudes of others, great and small, came out, or were cast out, from the Associated Baptists, because they could not rest content with the fellowship of a narrow sect, when they felt the uplifting power

of Christ's prayer for the unity of his people in the holy communion of a universal Christian brotherhood. God have mercy on those who could so rest content! It is to be told to the eternal honor of the men I have named, that they belonged not to that class. There is no people on earth today, who are so clearly no "offshoot," as Webster defines the word, from any sect that ever existed, as the Disciples of Christ—according to Prof. Whitsitt, "more commonly called Campbellites!" There had been, as in every other movement of great magnitude and enduring character, a long period of preparation. The souls of men had been anxiously studying the most vital problems of the common faith, and the current teaching had no solution to offer which could be accepted as satisfactory. The usual presentations of the way of life and salvation were far removed from the simplicity and tangibility of the New Testament period. The ready appropriation of Christ as Savior, which was so marked a feature of the apostolic era, had been lost utterly. Men were groping their ways in darkness, where at first all had been light and blessedness. They found themselves bewildered by subtle distinctions impossible to minds untrained in religious metaphysics. On one side of them was the bane of formalism, and on the other the upas of mysticism. For the basis of their personal assurance of salvation, they had been compelled to fall back on emotional

experiences, which sober common sense—whenever they gave it free and honest play—told them were quite as untrustworthy as the fantastic stuff of which dreams are made. No wonder they felt themselves impelled to seek after the "old paths," that they might find once more the peace which in the hearts of the first Christians, had been an everflowing river. If Glas and Sandeman and M'Lean were among the leaders who sought relief from current perplexities in speculation, and current phantasms of experience, by a thorough study, *de novo*, of the apostolic gospel, and the spiritual life of the first Christians, then there is no higher title to enduring honor in the kingdom of heaven than that to which they may lay humble, but honest claim. It is to be frankly conceded that, to some extent at least, this honor is due to them. And in so far as they may have contributed, however indirectly, to shape the most fruitful movement of our modern period, the day of eternity will decree them full reward. Heaven forbid that we should claim for the Campbells, and Stones, and Johnsons, and Smiths, of our own day, the honor which rightfully belongs to others. If Alexander Campbell built upon a foundation which other men had laid, let him have simply the credit which is his due. But truth is no more divine, no less effectual to salvation, whether M'Lean or Campbell first brought it to the light again, in these ends of the ages. If Sandeman

and M'Lean saw what truth they did see but dimly, it should not be thought strange. If Campbell saw more truth, and saw it more clearly, it does not make him greater or better than they. Truth has always made its way through difficulties, and its celestial shape has never greeted the eyes of men, save through the mists and fogs which evermore enwrap our nether world. If Sandeman or M'Lean is the real leader to whom our divine movement owes its origin, be it so. Who cares? This is not especially a question of whom, but of what? Not who began the work, humanly speaking, but, is it of God? Save for this single question, we care not a farthing. If our origin could really be traced in fairness to Robert Sandeman, it would not give us a moment's concern. Who is Sandeman? Who is Campbell? All truth is of God; and whether Sandeman or Campbell proclaim it, God's truth shall stand forever. This is simply a question of priority in discovery. It has, at most, that value, and not a scruple more. Please let all the Whitsitt's in the world understand how little the issue they have raised affects our confidence in the truth we plead. We hold it, and plead it, not because it is from Campbell, or is supposed by some partisan to have been advocated by Sandeman, but because it is from God, and shall stand the ordeal of the last day!

CHAPTER III.

AN HISTORICAL SKETCH.

It is not proposed to follow our author into the minute, and, for the most part, insignificant matters of detail, into which he has seen fit to enter at great length; in the first place, because a discussion of these details is not needed, and, in the second place, because the purpose I have in view may be better accomplished in another way. An independent statement of the chief historical points preliminary to our discussion will be more satisfactory to seekers after truth than an examination, *seriatim*, of statements, often unimportant, and, generally irrelevant to the main issue.

"No man," says Paul, "liveth or dieth to himself." We are inseparable parts of a total humanity, in spite of individual self-assertion within narrow limits. No man has ever lived whose character and achievements were not determined, to a great extent, by the conditions in the midst of which his individual lot was cast. We can not wholly escape our environment, though we exert ourselves ever so strenuously. The cultivated man of to-day is indeed the heir of all the ages. The great tides of life and thought come rushing in upon us from the past, and we cannot shut them off, if we would. Even that which is peculiar to us as

individuals, that which we bring with us into the world, has been shaping itself through centuries of varied experience, along the almost infinitely extended lines of our personal ancestry. Apart from all possible inferences, these facts are simply undeniable. Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Campbell and all the world's great leaders, have been as much under the moulding influence of this great divine law as the men supposed to have been made of more common clay.

We go, therefore, to the prevailing tendencies, to the great controlling drifts of religious thought among the dissenting Protestants of Great Britain, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, that we may discover what were the influences in the midst of which Alexander Campbell was born and educated, and determine how far his individual development was moulded by these influences, and also to what extent they contributed to give shape and character to the movement which was the inspiration of his remarkable life. I have said "dissenting Protestants," because the intellectual currents in the established church were somewhat different, and, in any event, have little to do with the subject before us.

Among dissenters, especially those known, in a general way, as Independents, whether Baptist or Pedo-baptist, the period I have indicated was eminently formative. There were sharp discussions, tinged sometimes with bitterness, but the

various influences and counter-influences were at work, which ultimately imparted to them the theological trend and ecclesiastical forms that characterize, in the main, their descendants at the present time. In this period, Sandeman, Booth, Fuller and M'Lean, touched the high-water mark of their intellectual activity. At the same time, also, John Wesley was at the height of his wonderful career. And although his influence lay, for the most part, rather outside the lines of progress which mainly concern our inquiry, yet, indirectly, the religious thought of all sections of the Island, and all types of thinkers, were more or less affected. We cannot afford, therefore, to leave him wholly out of this brief survey.

Among the questions of special significance in this period, the most important, theologically, as I have already intimated, was that concerning the nature of "saving faith." But closely related to this, and scarcely less important to our present investigation, was a question as to the theological ground on which faith becomes the principle of justification under the gospel. Let us seek briefly to get at the very pith of these old-time controversies. Let us lose sight, if we can, of any bearing which our historical facts may have on present issues, or the theological standing of parties to present issues, for only thus shall we attain to that judicial impartiality which this investigation im-

peratively demands. Truth is everything, party is nothing.

To begin with John Wesley. He was, as the reader is presumed to know, a member of the Established Church of England. Early in life, he was greatly exercised over the indifference and impiety, not only of the laity of the Establishment, but of the very ministers of the sanctuary itself. He was thus led to organize, at Oxford, a little society, having for its object the promotion of godliness. This society soon came to be spoken of among the irreligious as "Wesley's godly club," and Prof. Whitsitt lends his sanction to this sneer—let us hope unintentionally—in referring to it by that designation. Afterwards Wesley went as a missionary to Georgia along with Gen. Oglethorpe, the founder of that colony. On the voyage out the vessel in which he sailed encountered a terrible storm, and Wesley, though an ordained priest in the Established Church, became greatly frightened. In the same company were some Moravian missionaries, whose superior calmnness greatly impressed him. Naturally, he was led to suspect some defect in his religious life, though it does not appear that any change took place in his religious views or experiences until after he had returned to England. Meantime, however, he had laid the foundation of his great life-work in America. Among his acquaintances at Oxford at this period was Peter Bohler, a Moravian preacher. Charles Wesley had

undertaken to teach Bohler the English language, and Peter, to repay one favor with another, straightway proceeded to teach Charles the Moravian theology. This was about the 20th of February, 1738. On the 21st day of May, Whitsunday, Charles Wesley "obtained the sense of adoption," whatever that may mean (for the New Testament furnishes no equivalent expression), and "just one week later," as a trustworthy chronicler tells us, "his brother John obtained the same blessing." We are further informed that "Bohler, aided by the testimony of several living witnesses, convinced him that to gain peace of mind he must renounce that dependence upon his own works which had hitherto been the bane of his experience, and replace it with a full reliance on the blood of Christ shed for *him*." At a Moravian society meeting in Aldersgate street, while one was reading Luther's statement of the change which God works in the heart through faith, Wesley himself says, "I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ alone for salvation; and an assurance was given me, that he had taken away *my* sin, even *mine*, and saved *me* from the law of sin and death."

These words deserve especial attention. They show us that the notion of a sensuous revelation of pardon, considered as an element of saving faith, came to John Wesley, and through him to Methodism, from the Moravian mystics. One can not help wondering what would have been the effect

upon the movement we now call Methodism, if Wesley's course had been wrought out free from contact with these excellent, but highly imaginative people. To Wesley himself, this Aldersgate street experience was conversion to Christ. Before that time he had not known Christ as his Savior. From this conviction, I presume, he never wavered. It would be interesting to know how many Methodist preachers so understand it do-day. Had John Wesley died before that notable event in his life, what would have been his fate? Ah! well! Let us hope that everyone sees things more clearly now. God grant it may be so!

It was a member of Mr. Wesley's Oxford Society, James Hervey, as Prof. Whitsitt correctly informs us, that wrote the "Dialogues between Theron and Aspasio." The leading feature of this work was the setting forth of the Methodist-Moravian conception of saving faith, and the experimental processes through which "the sense of adoption" is obtained. To this work of Hervey, Robert Sandeman replied. He took the ground of the Westminster divines, but went further, bravely insisting not only that "assurance is not inseparable from saving faith," but that it is really no part of saving faith, in any case. That is, the faith which saves, and the assurance of salvation, are distinct in consciousness, and that the latter necessarily depends on the former. Or, in other words, the consciousness of faith in Christ is the prior condition of con-

scious salvation. This I give as the substance, without caring to quote words. To the extent here stated, Abraham Booth, apparently, and Andrew Fuller, certainly, agreed with him. It is necessary to bear this in mind, for Prof. Whitsitt, seemingly, would make the impression that while the Scotch Baptists, whom he treats as Sandemanians pure and simple, agreed with Sandeman regarding the *nature* of faith, other Baptists did not. But Fuller and Sandeman did not differ on the *nature* of faith. On this question they agreed perfectly. They differed of course about other matters, but the agreement concerning the nature of faith must not be lost sight of, if we would have a clear view of the historic situation.

Now, among Baptists of the eighteenth century no name is more justly held in veneration than that of Andrew Fuller. To this all Baptists agree. He was in fact the leader of progressive Baptists in England, just as M'Lean was easily leader of the Baptists of Scotland. The exact differences between these distinguished men, as representing differences between two sections of the Baptist church militant, in their day, become important to us here, on account of their relation to the chief question which Prof. Whitsitt has raised. And as M'Lean confessedly agreed with Sandeman in the controversies regarding faith, I shall draw on him for what information is needed on that side of the question. Prof. Whitsitt will not object to this.

Our comparison, therefore, will be between M'Lean and Fuller. In the first place, we shall hear Fuller, the Baptist *par excellence*, as he is regarded among American Baptists to-day.

In his preface to his "Gospel worthy of all Acceptation," Mr. Fuller tells us that "he had formerly held different sentiments" from those advocated in that book. For years, however, he had been in doubt. These doubts had arisen chiefly from thinking upon certain passages of Scripture which seemed clearly to imply that repentance and faith are the "immediate duty" of all men to whom the gospel offer of salvation comes. This is the main thesis of his book, and his statement, on its very face, shows the Antinomian tendencies which he had formerly cherished. But besides the Scripture texts, the reading of the labors of Elliot, Brainerd, and others, who had been eminently successful among the American Indians, had greatly impressed him. Like the apostles, the work of these men seemed to be plain before them. In "their addresses to these benighted heathen, they seemed to have none of the difficulties with which he felt himself encumbered." That is to say, he had been a very narrow Calvinist, and his theories of inability, passive regeneration, limited atonement, etc., had been in his way. Besides, he had regarded appropriation as being of the very essence of saving faith, so that, without a sort of special revelation, no one could be a true believer;

or indeed had a warrant to believe. But slowly he was beginning to see light. For four years he wrestled with his doubts, disclosing them to no one. "Once in company with a minister, whom he greatly respected (could he have been a Sandemanian minister?), "it was thrown out as a matter of inquiry, Whether we had generally entertained just notions concerning unbelief. It was common to speak of unbelief as a calling in question the truth of our personal religion; whereas, he remarked, 'It was the calling in question the truth of what God had said.' "This remark," Fuller says, "seemed to carry in it its own evidence." Pending questions of "origins" and "offshoots," we can not but regret that the name of this sensible minister has been withheld from us. Alexander Campbell once intimated a suspicion that Fuller had learned the best things he knew from the Sandemanians, and though Fuller tells us that at this time he had not read Sandeman's writings, it is not at all impossible that the excellent minister in question had both read them, and profited by them. In any event, the incident here recorded let the first glimmer of the new light into Fuller's soul. From the point of view thus attained, "his thoughts," he tells us, "began to enlarge." He preached upon the subject "more than once." Finally, he began "to consider faith as *a persuasion of the truth of what God hath said.*" He was "aware that the generality of Christians with whom he was ac-

quainted viewed *the belief of the gospel* as something pre-supposed in faith, rather than as being of the essence of it; and considered the contrary as the opinion of Mr. Robert Sandeman, which they were agreed in regarding as favorable to a dead or inoperative kind of faith." At this time, as I said a moment since, Mr. Fuller assures us he had read none of Sandeman's works. Afterwards he read both Sandeman and M'Lean, and says expressly that he was in "accord with them in considering the belief of the gospel as saving faith," but that he and they attached different ideas to "believing." Concerning these differences, we shall see clearly before we are through this examination. It is sufficient here, if the reader notes distinctly, that as regards the *nature* of faith, Fuller says plainly that he was in accord with Sandeman and M'Lean. (See preface to Fuller's Gospel, *passim*, and also appendix to sixth American edition, Page 168, where he says in so many words: "I have the pleasure to agree with Mr. M'Lean in considering the belief of the gospel as saving faith. Our disagreement on this subject is confined to the question, *What the belief of the gospel includes*.")

It is clear therefore, that Fuller, Sandeman and M'Lean, were in entire accord on the nature of faith, and we may proceed at once to other items of interest. It is worth while, however, to note briefly, in passing, the steps by which Mr. Fuller seems to have reached his conclusion, "*that faith*

is the persuasion of the truth of what God hath said." He expressly tells us he had "felt himself encumbered with difficulties" while holding another view. This statement surely ought to surprise no one, and can surprise no one who has thoughtfully considered what it involves. It seems to lie on the surface of the New Testament, that repentance and faith are the immediate duty of all men on hearing the gospel. But the duty to believe implies, of course, a divine warrant, and also that there is nothing in the nature of faith to make the performance of the duty impossible. A warrant to believe means the universality of the atonement, and the *natural ability* of the sinner to accept it. Fuller still held the doctrine of the sinner's *moral inability* to repent and believe, but his theological scheme took slight account of it. The ground of such inability was in man's sinful nature, in the obliquity of his will, and the aversion of his heart to God, and hence his unbelief was his own fault. If there is natural ability—that is, if there are the *natural faculties* which make faith possible, after the sinful disposition has been removed by divine grace—it is a sufficient basis for the obligation to believe. It does not matter that this sinful disposition comes from inherited depravity, and that it reaches back to the fall of Adam, for though the sinner may have lost his ability to obey, God has not lost his right to command. But Fuller saw clearly enough, that, if

faith contains in its own essence the assurance of a personal interest in Christ, it cannot be the sinner's duty to believe, until the knowledge of salvation has been bestowed. So he rejected the doctine of Hervey and "the generality of Christians with whom he was acquainted," and accepted the only view of faith which seemed to him to be consistent with the sinner's obligation to believe. In this final outcome of his reasoning, he was unquestionably right, however cloudy his speculations in regard to the difference between natural and moral ability may seem to us, in the clearer light of our own time.

Fuller, Sandeman and M'Lean, were also in complete accord regarding the necessity of a special divine influence in order to enable the sinner to believe. The differences among them concerning "what is included in believing" did not affect this particular at all. The proof here is ample, and, I presume, will not be denied. I therefore pass on.

The differences which we have to note begin at this point. Sandeman and M'Lean held that faith, in its last analysis, is the mind's acceptance of "God's testimony concerning his Son," and that holiness of disposition is the *effect* of faith. Fuller, on his part, unable to escape entirely from the influence of his earlier view, maintained, that the implantation of "a principle of holiness" is antecedent to faith, and thus included in it, as a part

of its essence. Briefly, the difference in our style of speaking, is this: According to Fuller, change of heart takes place before faith—is, indeed, the one condition without which faith is impossible —while Sandeman and M'Lean insisted strenuously that holiness of heart is secured only *through* faith. In other words, the difference is that between antecedent and consequent; between cause, in a certain sense, and effect. It is not to be maintained that these distinctions amount to nothing, or that general unanimity has, even now, been attained in regard to them. It may be thought that they are of little practical account, and plain Christians, devoted mainly to questions of organization and work, will be inclined, no doubt, to pass them by as unimportant; but as long as the human mind insists on having a rational and symmetrical representation of the truth it holds, all the more thoughtful disciples of the Lord will see the necessity of giving to such questions due importance in their scheme of religious thought.

If regeneration be the same thing as a change of heart (which has been generally held by the so-styled Evangelical denominations), then Fuller's theology places regeneration before faith; while, according to Sandeman and M'Lean, regeneration is *through* faith, and therefore, after it. Baptists, to-day, for the most part, stand on Fuller's ground, but the Disciples, without exception reject it as

anti-scriptural and irrational. Of this there is no pretense of denial, whatever inferences men like Mr. Whitsitt may see fit to draw from it. But while the "generality" of Baptists adopt Fuller's doctrine of the necessity of "a holy principle in order to believing," few of them, I am persuaded, will accept, without great qualification, his definition of saving faith. The fact is, our modern Baptists are still with Hervey and the Methodists in their view of that question. The logically impossible theory which Fuller gave up for what Dr. Clifford has recently styled a better "working theology," is still maintained among them with essential unanimity. What Baptist preacher now speaks of faith as "the persuasion of the truth of what God has revealed?" Or who among them has been known to define it as "the belief of the gospel?" And yet among the English Baptists of the latter half of the last century, this was Fuller's most characteristic contention. He boldly took this ground when "the generality of Christians with whom he was acquainted" rejected it as the doctrine of Robert Sandeman. On this question our modern Baptists are not Fullerites. The fact is, they hold with remarkable unanimity that "the sense of adoption," save in very rare cases, is the real test of saving faith. It is to this test that the applicant for church membership is, in the first place, invariably subjected. Failing here, he may not be positively rejected, but his "experience" is

certain to be regarded as defective at the most vital point. Oh! for another Fuller to lead them quite out of the wilderness in whose depths they are still wandering!

But besides the matter here considered, there were certain differences concerning the ground upon which faith justifies, which seem to demand some notice in our present survey. In any possible view of the matter, faith is, so to say, the act —if one may call it an act—of the creature. It is the sinner that believes, not God. And no view of enabling grace that one may hold in the least affects this conclusion. Say, if the reader chooses, that faith is the gift of God—a position which was not in debate among the men whose views we are looking into—and it still remains true, that the sinner, being divinely enabled, "believes the gospel," or "accepts the testimony of God concerning Christ." Now this faith, which is undeniably the sinner's own act, either has in it, or has not, the element of *holiness;* it contains, or does not contain, in itself, intrinsic moral or spiritual value. But if faith contain in itself holiness, how is justification by faith a gracious justification? For in such case, a holy principle in the sinner is made the basis of his justification. So reasoned M'Lean, and Fuller replied as best he could. M'Lean pressed the difficulty upon him with great vigor and effect. I take no side in their controversy. They were able men, but they were both

in the fog. That my readers may have a clear view of this old-time discussion, I beg leave to offer a few extracts for their consideration. As a specimen of theological dialectics, a hundred years ago, it cannot fail to interest them.

"This knowledge and belief of the truth as it is in Jesus, although a duty incumbent on all who hear the gospel, is nevertheless the special gift of God, being the effect of divine teaching by means of the Word, and peculiar to the elect; so that whatever appearances there may be of it in false professors, they have not at bottom the same perception of truth, nor that persuasion of it upon its proper evidence which real believers have. But as we can not discern the difference by the confession of the mouth, when that confession accords with the form of sound words, it is therefore necessary that true faith should be distinguished by its general effects upon the heart and life.

"As to its effects upon the heart, such is the important, interesting and salutary nature of the truth testified in the gospel, with its suitableness and freeness for the chief of sinners, that it is no sooner perceived and believed, than it takes possession of the will and affections, and becomes in the soul the ground of its hope, trust and reliance; the object of its desire, acceptance, esteem and joy; and the principle of every holy, active and gracious disposition of the heart.

"But these effects of faith, or which is the same,

of the truth believed, ought not to be confounded with faith itself, as is commonly done. Though faith is the confidence of things hoped for, and also worketh by love; yet it is neither hope nor love, for the apostle distinguisheth it from both. And now abideth faith, hope and love—these three. The same may be said of its other effects upon the heart, for whatever is more than belief is more than faith, and ought to go by another name.

"It will, perhaps be asked, why so nice in distinguishing here? What harm can arise from including in the nature of faith such holy dispositions, affections and exercises of heart, as are confessedly inseparable from it? In answer to this, let it be considered.

1. That unless we carefully distinguish faith from its effects, particularly on the point of a sinner's acceptance with God, the important doctrine of free justification by faith alone, will be materially affected. The Scriptures pointedly declare that God 'justifies freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,' and that this justification is 'received through faith in Christ's blood.' Faith in this case is always distinguished from, and opposed to, the works of the law; not merely of the ceremonial law which was peculiar to the Jews, but of that law by which is the knowledge of sin, which says: 'Thou shalt not covet,' and which requires not

only outward good actions, but love, and every good disposition of heart, both towards God and our neighbor; so that the works of the law respect the heart as well as life. The distinction, therefore, between faith and works, on this subject, is not that which is between inward and outward conformity to the law; for if faith is not in this case, distinguished from and opposed to our conformity to the law, both outwardly and inwardly, it can not be said that we are 'justified by faith without the deeds of the law,' or that God 'justifieth the ungodly.' Faith indeed, as a principle of action, 'worketh by love;' but it is not as thus working that it is "imputed for righteousness;" for it is expressly declared that 'righteousness is imputed to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly.' 'It is of faith' that it might be by grace; and grace and works are represented as being imcompatible with each other; for to him that worketh the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt.'

Now when men include in the very nature of justifying faith, such good dispositions, holy affections, and pious exercises of heart as the moral law requires, and so make them necessary (no matter under what consideration) to a sinner's acceptance with God, it perverts the gospel doctrine on this important subject, and makes justification to be at least, as it were, by the works of the law."

—M'Lean on The Commission, Cincinnati, 1871, Pages 72, 74.

The reader will easily note the points here made. (a) Faith is the special gift of God. (b) It is peculiar to the elect. (c) It is distinguished by its genuine effects upon the heart and life. (d) But these effects are, in point of fact, inseparable from it—*i. e.*, they always follow it immediately. (e) They must not, however, be confounded with it, as is commonly done. "Whatever is more than belief, is more than faith, and ought to go by another name." (f) Especially is faith to be distinguished from its effects in the matter of justification, for if faith is held to include in its nature, holiness of disposition, the sinner is accepted on the ground of such holiness, and justification by faith is no longer justification by grace, but to all intents and purposes, justification by law, or by works. (g) Further, it could not be said in that case that "He justifieth the ungodly," for faith is supposed to include a godly state of the heart. These points are, of course, keenly made, but it is easy to see how much, and how little, such speculations had to do with the "origin of the Disciples of Christ."

Andrew Fuller, as has been said, took a very different ground. We must also allow him to speak for himself.

"I have the pleasure," says Fuller, "to agree with Mr. M'Lean in considering the belief of the

gospel as saving faith. Our disagreement on this subject, is confined to the question: "*What the belief of the gospel includes.*" Mr. M. so explains it, as to carefully exclude every exercise of the heart or will, as either included in it, or having any influence upon it. Whatever of this exists in a believer, he considers as belonging to the *effects* of faith, rather than to faith itself. If I understand him, he pleads for such a belief of the gospel, as has nothing in it of a holy nature, nothing of conformity to the moral law 'in heart or life;" a *passive* reception of truth, in which the will has no concern; and this, because it is opposed *to the works of the law* in the article of justification. On this ground, he accounts for the apostle's language in Rom. 4: 5: 'To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the *ungodly;*' understanding by the terms, 'he that worketh not,' one who has done nothing yet which is pleasing to God; and by the term 'ungodly,' 'one that is actually an enemy to God.' (It must be remembered that Mr. Fuller is here saying how he understands M'Lean. Whether he understood him correctly, or not, the reader will judge from the words of M., himself, as quoted above.) * * * * *

"If Mr. M. had only affirmed that faith is opposed to works, even to every good disposition of the heart, as the *ground of acceptance with God;* that we are not justified by it *as a work;* or that

whatever moral goodness it may possess, it is not *as such* that it is imputed to us for righteousness, there had been no dispute between us. But this distinction he rejects." "He is not contented with faith being opposed to works in point of justification; it must also be opposed to them in its own nature. In short, if there be any possibility of drawing a certain conclusion from what a writer, in almost every form of speech, has advanced, it must be concluded that he means to deny that there is anything holy in the nature of faith; and that could it be separated from its effects, as he supposes it is in justification, it would leave the person who possessed it, among the enemies of God." "Mr. M. allows faith to be a *duty*—it is 'the command of God,' and a 'part of obedience to God,'—that to believe what God says is *right*, and that unbelief, which is its opposite, is a great and heinous sin.' But how can these things agree? If there be nothing of the exercise of a holy disposition in what is *commanded* of God, in what is *right*, and in what is an exercise of *obedience;* by what rule are we to judge of what is holy and what is not? I can scarcely conceive of a truth more self-evident than this, 'That God's commands extend only to that which comes under the influence of the will.' Knowledge can be no further a duty, nor ignorance a sin, than each is influenced by the moral state of the heart; and the same is true of faith and unbelief. To receive

truth into the *heart*, indeed, is duty; for this is voluntary acquiescence in it; but that in which the will has no concern, can not possibly be so." Fuller's Gospel, Sixth American edition, Cin., 1832. Appendix. Pages 168-170.

I can not afford space for further extracts; nor is it necessary. The gist of the debate, and the main positions of the disputants, are apparent enough from what I have given. I hope no reader has felt a weariness stealing over him, as he has sought to follow these champions in their conflict over issues, which, in their 18th century form, are not now heard of at all. They are not without interest, however, as showing important points of connection in the continuous development of religious thought.

It is important to our inquiry that the precise position of the parties to these old issues shall be distinctly understood. How far Fuller and M'Lean agreed, and precisely wherein they differed, may not be entitled to the least weight in determining what is true or false, in our discussion of doctrines at the present time, but, if the question relate to an influence exerted, or said to have been exerted, upon the mind of Mr. Campbell, and through him upon the Disciples of Christ, by these half-forgotten conflicts, they straightway become interesting to us. It is on this account, solely, that I have asked the attention of my readers to the details which have been thus far presented;

and for the same reason I must solicit their indulgence while I seek to throw still more light upon the subject. I prefer to risk the charge of tediousness, rather than that of obscurity, on any vital point.

It can not be without interest to us to note the fact that when Fuller speaks of *repentance* and *faith*, he uniformly places the words in this order, while M'Clean adopts the contrary order of *faith* and *repentance*. It would doubtless be a great mistake to suppose that the naked question of the order in which faith and repentance take place in the sinner's return to God was regarded by either of these distinguished men as a matter of special importance. There is no reason why it should have been so considered. The truth is, that the way of speaking which we here observe has a much deeper significance. It goes, indeed, to the very roots of rival theologies. With Fuller, as we have seen, faith was always the act of a regenerate soul. For while he insisted that it was the sinner's immediate duty to believe, he, at the same time, firmly maintained that it was impossible for him to do so, until the obstructing hindrance of native depravity had been removed. This is the sole meaning of his contention for the necessity of a *principle of holiness in order to believing*. Faith is only possible to a renewed heart. The implantation of a holy disposition precedes it in every case. Naturally, he thought repentance

would be the first expression of this new principle of holiness, even though the subject might not himself be conscious of its priority. In "The Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation"—Sixth American edition, Cincinnati, 1832—we have the following statement and illustration: "That the bias of the heart requires to be turned to God, antecedent to believing, has been admitted, because the nature of believing is such that it can not be exercised while the soul is under the dominion of wilful blindness, hardness and aversion. These dispositions are represented in the Scriptures as a bar in the way of faith, as being inconsistent with it; and which, consequently, require to be taken out of the way. But whatever necessity there may be for a change of heart in order to believing, it is neither necessary nor possible that the party should be conscious of it till he has believed. It is necessary that the eyes of a blind man should be opened before he can see, but it is neither necessary nor possible for him to know that his eyes are open till he doth see. It is only by surrounding objects appearing to his view, that he knows the obstructing film to be removed." This is in reply to a Mr. Brine, who, while agreeing with Fuller, that regeneration or change of heart precedes faith, argues therefrom that only the regenerate have a warrant to believe. To set this aside, Fuller says in effect, that though it be indeed true that regeneration precedes faith, it is no

more possible for the party to be conscious of his regeneration till he believes, than for a blind man to know that his eyes have been opened before he is conscious of seeing. Faith is the soul's seeing, and regeneration is the removal of the film from the soul's eyes.

Again: (Appendix pp. 214,215) "All I contend for is, 'that it is not by means of a spiritual perception, or belief of the gospel, that the heart is, for the first time, effectually influenced towards God: for spiritual perception and belief are represented as the *effects*, and not as the causes of such influence."

"*A spiritual perception of the glory of divine things appears to be the first sensation of which the mind is conscious; but it is not the first operation of God upon it.*"

It is clear, therefore, that in the strict theological sense, Fuller placed regeneration before faith; as the removal of the film from a blind man's eyes necessarily precedes the act of seeing. But as regards repentance and faith, he says expressly, that "saving faith *implies* repentance;" *i. e.*, repentance, in the order of Christian experience, comes before faith. Appendix, p. 179.

So his theology stood thus: (1) Regeneration; (2) Repentance; (3) Faith. This may seem strange when we remember that he defined faith as "the belief of the gospel;" or as "*the persuasion of the truth of what God hath said.*" But

there can be no doubt that such was his view, though we may totally fail to see how he could obviate, in his own mind, the difficulties which it involves. Great men are not always consistent, with themselves, to say nothing of their want of consistency with truth seen clearly by other people.

While, therefore, there can be no debate as to the view maintained by Fuller, it is quite as certain that M'Lean held the directly opposite position. With the former, a change of heart was thought to precede any real "belief of the gospel;" while the latter strenuously insisted, that *repentance*, and all *holy dispositions*, were to be regarded as the *effects* of such belief. It is this single feature of their protracted debates, which has descended, as a living issue, to the Christian thinkers of to-day. The sharp controversy between these men, and the schools to which they belonged, concerning the ground on which faith is acounted for righteouness, whether holy dispositions were to be excluded from the nature of faith in order that justification might be an act of sovereign grace, and all kindred contentions, are no longer in debate anywhere. To all well informed people, this goes with the saying. Argument is unnecessary. But Fuller's opponents met him with the objection that regeneration before faith, implies the contradiction of a *godly unbeliever*. "A spiritual perception of the glory of divine

things," says Fuller, "is the first sensation of which the mind is conscious, but it is not the first operation of God upon it." Of this first operation, regeneration is the immediate effect, and faith is the effect of regeneration. The consciousness of faith, so to say, reveals the fact of regeneration, as a prior work of the Spirit. But, if this be the order of experience, it is impossible to say certainly that regeneration may not be separated from faith by an interval of time. In any event, if a holy disposition precedes faith, *godliness* comes first, and *faith* afterwards. On the other hand, the retort was ready, that, if all holy dispositions must be excluded from faith, as not of its essence, and, in point of fact, not co-existent with it, at the moment of justification, then, this theory gives the equal absurdity of an *ungodly believer*. M'Lean insisted most strenuouly that the justification of the *ungodly* (which Paul expressly teaches,) implies that the act of justification attaches to faith in advance of the holy dispositions which follow it. In this case, who can say that the theory is not open to the charge brought against it? Does it not involve the contradiction, momentarily, at least, of an *ungodly believer?* Looking back at this discussion, from our present point of view, it seems safe to say that each of these theologians succeeded in overturning, in part, his opponent's theory. Both were right, and both were wrong; but in a different way. Fuller

was wrong in maintaining the priority of regeneration to faith, and M'Lean was equally wrong in arguing that a gracious justification excludes all holy dispositions from the soul, at the moment when God justifies. It is strange that so acute a thinker should have been bewildered by the mere logic of the letter, in a matter which now seems so clear. To do equal justice, it must be said that Fuller did not admit that, in ordinary cases, faith is separated from regeneration in time, nor did M'Lean teach, that the holy dispositions which proceed from faith, are separated from it in consciousness. "The priority contended for," says Fuller, "is rather in the order of nature than of time." "And if there be a priority in the order of time, owing to the want of opportunity of knowing the truth, yet when a person embraces Christ so far as he has the means of knowing him, he is in effect a believer." On the other hand M'Lean says expressly, that "*the saving truth testified in the gospel, is no sooner perceived and believed than it takes possession of the will and affections, and becomes in the soul the ground of its hope and reliance, and the principle of every holy, active and gracious disposition of the heart.*"

It must be admitted, I think, that Fuller's doctrine of regeneration before faith is inconsistent with his definition of faith. For if faith be "the persuasion of the truth of what God hath said," it is the necessary condition of all saving influ-

ences exerted by means of the gospel. Whatever precedes the "belief of the gospel," is accomplished without the gospel. If regeneration precedes "the belief of the gospel," then the gospel is not the means of regeneration, and all those passages of Scripture which teach the instrumentality of God's word in regeneration, are rendered void and unmeaning. It seems clear that most Baptists now perceive Fuller's inconsistency at this point, for they have given up his view of the nature of faith. They do not teach that faith is "the persuasion of the truth of what God hath said;" nor do they define faith as "the belief of the gospel." They are not satisfied to regard faith as the root of good dispositions, and the mainspring of all holy and gracious activities, nor do they recognize the dominant element of intellectual conviction, which the Scriptures everywhere give to it, but, on the contrary, resolve it, in effect, into a mere emotional experience, from which, the scriptural idea of *belief* has been well nigh eliminated. Besides this, as I intimated above, they have practically gone back to the doctrine of faith against which all Fuller's writings were an earnest and vehement protest. Like Wesley, they regard an emotional consciousness of pardon as the very essence of true faith. The point evermore insisted upon, in judging of conversion, is the *feeling* testimony of the forgiveness of sins. "Do you, my brother or sister, *feel* that God, for Christ's sake,

has pardoned you?" is a question never omitted. It is not the consciousness of faith so much as the mystic sense of salvation, which is the uniform criterion of judgment, when the church with open doors sits for reception of converts into its pale. This is consistent with Wesleyanism, and Moravianism, or even with the Antinomianism from which Fuller vainly sought to deliver them, but it is inconsistent with Fuller's most characteristic contention, and utterly inconsistent with the plainest teaching of the New Testament.

It may be well, in this connection, to note another feature of Fuller's teaching, which our American Baptists have quite lost sight of. Fuller insisted with all the might he possessed, that faith is the sinner's immediate duty; that there was no duty before "repentance and faith," not even prayer. Nothing is enjoined upon a sinner that does not imply repentance and faith. "It is the duty of ministers not only to exhort their carnal auditors to believe in Jesus Christ for the salvation of their souls, but *it is at our peril to exhort them to anything short of it, or which does not involve, or imply it.*" The italics here are Mr. Fuller's own, and show the importance he attached to what he was saying. But to shut out all mistake, listen to the following, leveled at some of the preaching of his time: "Repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ are allowed to be duties; but not *immediate* duties.

The sinner is considered as unable to comply with them, and, therefore, they are not urged upon him; but instead of them he is directed to pray for the Holy Spirit to enable him to repent and believe, and this it seems he can do notwithstanding the aversion of his heart to everything of the kind. But if any man be required to pray for the Holy Spirit, it must be either sincerely, and in the name of Jesus, or insincerely, and in some other way. The latter I suppose will be allowed to be an abomination in the sight of God; he can not therefore be required to do this; and as to the former, it is just as difficult, and as opposite to the carnal heart as repentance and faith themselves. Indeed, it amounts to the same thing; for a sincere desire after a spiritual blessing, presented in the name of Jesus, is no other than the "*prayer of faith.*" If I knew how to emphasize these words, so that all Baptists in this land would be constrained to take note of them, and prayerfully study them, I would gladly do it. There is just one emphatic point to be made; namely, there is no duty enjoined in the gospel, which does not imply faith and repentance in order to its acceptable performance. It may be doubted if Fuller himself saw the far-reaching significance of his own words, but he did see the simple fact which he states so clearly, otherwise, he could never have put it into phraseology so terse, and so unmistakable as regards, at least, its primary meaning. I cordially

commend to all Baptists this significant deliverance of their great leader. And if they shall see, in the light of it, the necessity of changing somewhat their teaching, and reconstructing thoroughly some of their practices, I shall be fully repaid for my labor of love in calling their attention to it.

Meantime, I need only say now, that Fuller and M'Lean both blundered as to "what is included in believing." Fuller was mistaken as to its including regeneration, or change of heart, *as a prior condition*, and M'Lean, as to the necessity of excluding from its essence the change of heart, which he admitted to be its immediate effect. Faith, as the ground of justification, is a comprehensive conception. In the last analysis, it is indeed the mind's conviction "of the truth of what God hath said;" the "belief of the gospel;" but not that to the exclusion of any of its divine effects in the soul or in the life. On the contrary, as the principle of justification, it is taken as inclusive of all these effects, and never, for a moment, thought of in the divine mind, as apart from them. It is indeed faith which is accounted for righteousness, and not hope, or love, or any other effect of faith, but it is because it is viewed as the root, and ground of all these things, and because they are comprehended in it, as an effect is always included in its cause, that God accepts it for "righteousness," (which, in point of fact, it is not,) and so justifies the obedient believer "freely by his

grace." If a man does not see these things clearly in the dry light of to-day, it is surely his own fault.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SIMPLE FACTS OF THE CASE.

We are now ready to estimate the influence of these various parties upon the mind of Mr. Campbell, and to decide how far the representations of Mr. Whitsitt are entitled to the credence of candid men. It is true that Mr. Campbell read Hervey, Wesley, and Fuller and Gale, Sandeman, M'Lean, and the Haldanes, and that he was quite familiar with the positions of all these gentlemen, and their arguments in support of them. That their discussions had no influence on the formation of his views, it would be foolish to assert. But, that he followed no one-sided representation is certain, for he carefully read and weighed the arguments of all. If his own statements are entitled to the least credit, he was, more than anything else, a devoted student of the New Testament, and was accustomed to bring all theories and suggestions of theories to the touch-stone of revelation, before receiving or rejecting them. If he was indebted to any one, to Sandeman or M'Lean, to Wesley or Fuller, for views that he finally held, it was in precisely the same way that every independent and conscientious investigator is indebted to some one else, either directly or indirectly, for the greater part of the truth which he knows. This is

as certain as anything human can be. At the same time, it is only fair to say that, in certain of their features, Mr. Campbell's views were kindred to those of M'Lean and the Haldanes, rather than to those of Fuller and the school of which he was practically the founder. Regarding the *nature* of faith, as then debated, he agreed with Sandeman, M'Lean and Fuller, as they, confessedly, agreed with each other. Concerning the priority of regeneration or faith, he was with M'Lean and the Scotch Baptists, and opposed to Fuller and his followers, whether in England or America. He never sympathized with the view that justification by faith implies the exclusion of all the holy dispositions which follow faith, and the imputation of "the bare belief of the bare truth" for righteousness. On this point he was distinctly anti-Sandemanian. His view of the design of baptism was the product of honest and patient study of the New Testament. He borrowed it from no one, nor is it identical with that held by any party since the days of the apostles, and their immediate successors. It is no more the baptismal regeneration of the Greek and Latin fathers, or of Catholics and Anglicans, than it is the notion of a mere outward sign or symbol of an inward grace, now held by Baptists, and, for the most part, Pedo-baptists, alike. It is not baptismal regeneration as it has been held, at any time, by any party. Much less is it the view which represents baptism as a mere

symbolical representation of that with which the New Testament has connected it conditionally. To say that he borrowed it from M'Lean, whose theory required the imputation of faith for righteousness, not only before obedience to any ordinance, but even antecedent to that *holiness of heart* which he robustly held to be an immediate effect of faith, is to talk at random, or to be incapable of making the simplest distinctions of doctrine known to theology. In maintaining the necessity of a plurality of elders, or bishops, in each local church, as well as the observance of the Lord's Supper on every Lord's day, Mr. Campbell agreed substantially with the Sandemanians and Scotch Baptists, because he found them in line with the precedents of the New Testament. Their observance of foot-washing and love-feasts, as ordinances, he rejected, as being destitute of apostolic or inspired support. To this test he brought everything. That he made no mistakes, need not be said, for he was a man, fallible like the rest of us. His greatest admirers have never felt themselves bound to any position he held, unless he was able to show his authority for it in the Word of God. This was his test, and it is theirs likewise. He was no mere theological eclectic, selecting from the great babel about him whatever might happen to strike his own fancy; but a reverent and thoughtful Christian, seeking for the faith and ordinances of the church in the teaching

of the inspired apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. If he felt a certain admiration for the English and Scotch Independents, Baptist or Pedo-baptist, it was mainly because they refused to be bound by human creeds, and bravely asserted their right to the freedom wherewith Christ had made them free. That traces of the influence of Sandeman and the Haldanes may be found in his writings, is unquestionable. There are traces of Alexandrian influence in John's Gospel, as every scholar knows—whether he chooses to say so or not—and yet that fact counts nothing against John's originality as a writer, or the genuineness of the book which bears his name. A work free from any influence from without would be a strange literary product indeed. A theologian whose views should betray no contact with the work of other thinkers, might indeed be considered original, but it is not likely that he would be able to say anything worthy of the world's attention.

In this perfectly legitimate way, and in no other, did Mr. Campbell profit by the labors of other men. The sources of authority which he recognized were in the Scriptures, and he neither received nor rejected anything without reference to scriptural teaching. As regards his real indebtedness to Sandeman and the Scotch Baptist leaders, there has been no pretence of concealment. Prof. Whitsitt naively confesses, even while making a show of original discovery, his de-

pendence upon Mr. C.'s biographer for the facts which explain the coincidences he had otherwise noted. This should have taught him that his imaginary contributions to history are only gleanings from fields which have been duly harvested by others.

Mr. Campbell's absolute independence, as a Biblical student, of all uninspired authority, is nowhere seen more clearly than in the comparison of his views with those of the men from whom it is pretended he borrowed them. He was a Sandemanian, says Prof. Whitsitt; and yet Sandeman was a Calvinist, a Pedo-baptist, and practiced foot-washing, and observed love-feasts, while Mr. Campbell was neither a Calvinist nor Pedo-baptist, and held not at all to the Sandemanian customs here mentioned. He had no sympathy with the notion that justification by faith means the imputation of "the bare belief of the bare truth," for righteousness, exclusive of those holy dispositions which are the invariable effects of a sincere belief. On the contrary, he always held that faith justifies and saves, only because it does include—as a cause includes its effects—both change of heart and obedience of life. He never held that faith is purely intellectual, as Prof. W. insinuates. I suspect, if he had undertaken to be closely analytical (a thing he seldom attempted), he would have said that in its ultimate ground, faith is that "act of the mind by which the sinner accepts

Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God," or "faith is the belief of the gospel;" or it is the receiving of "the testimony of God concerning his Son." He did say expressly: "Faith is the belief of the gospel." "You can make nothing else out of it, unless you turn it into *confidence*." He might have said, if pressed for strict accuracy, that "confidence is faith by metonomy;" but with him faith and confidence were always held to be practically identical, however he might have distinguished between them as a matter of precise definition. He did not share at all, therefore, in that barren intellectualism, which is charged—whether justly or otherwise—against Sandeman. What he really held, was this: faith is the sincere and intelligent belief of the gospel; and such belief always carries in it, by implication, a hearty personal confidence, or trust, in Christ as Redeemer and Savior of men. He never conceived of belief as exclusive of trust, any more than of pious and godly aspirations and volitions as exclusive of belief. If Sandemanianism may be described as "*intellectualism*," Mr. Campbell was no Sandemanian. Faith which did not include in it implicitly both holiness of heart and life, was of no account at all, as he understood the Scriptures. As a matter of fact, from the Baptist point of view, he was more open to the charge of including too much in faith than too little. He never practically separated faith, in justification and salvation, from those godly

emotions and activities which are superinduced by means of it. As he looked at the work of redemption, the gospel is the power of God to save only believers, because there is no other way in which gospel power can be conveyed to the hearts and lives of men than by faith. It is not what faith is, as a mere correct verbal definition, that God cares for, but what it means as a source or instrument of divine power in a human soul and life. *It is chiefly the grand possibility of a transformed human life that makes faith valuable in the sight of God.* As Mr. Campbell looked at it, nay, as all the Disciples of Christ see it, if it were not for this wonderful possibility of making sinful men grand and god-like in thought and will and action, we should never have had a word of justification by faith from the lips or pens of inspired men. God counts faith to the believer only for that which he knows is made possible to him by means of it! It is on this principle that faith is "imputed for righteousness," as an act of grace, and through the blood of Christ. And this is the opposite pole of doctrine from that of Sandeman and the Scotch Baptists, as even Prof. Whitsitt would be able to see if he could only get the Baptist film removed from his eyes. No partisan ever sees truth otherwise than from a single angle of vision, and therefore imperfectly.

But, as already stated, Mr. Campbell saw clearly the fact that as regards priority of regeneration

(or change of heart) to faith, Andrew Fuller was wrong, while Sandeman and M'Lean, who placed it among the *effects* of faith, were certainly right. If he really owed this view to those men, his indebtedness was indeed great. It was the most fundamental conception of what may be called his theology. It determined his view of divine influence in conversion and sanctification, as he himself defined those terms, beyond any manner of doubt. Not that it led him to deny the active presence of the Holy Spirit, either in regeneration or in the struggles and conflicts of the Christian life. He made no such denial in either case. What he did do was to explain the influences of the Holy Spirit, as mediated by the Word of God, *i. e.*, as exerted through the Word of God believed. The Scriptures represent the saving power as reaching the heart by faith. But whatever is done before faith, is done without faith, and independently of divine truth, as the means. Nothing could be plainer. Hence, Mr. Campbell did not accept Fuller's doctrine of a change of heart in order to faith. On the contrary, he steadfastly held that all saving power reaches the heart through faith. The ever present Spirit of God moves upon the human soul in, and by, and through, truth believed, and not in a way which dispenses, at any step in the saving process, either with the truth, as it is in Christ, or with the sincere and intelligent belief of it. This is the teaching of the Word of God beyond any

NEBRASKA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE LIBRARY

sort of doubt. If Sandeman and M'Lean saw it (which I think they did not, unless very dimly), then the world owes them a great debt, certainly. That Mr. Campbell saw it, admits no denial. And when we shall all see things in the bright light of the Eternal Throne, the fact that he not only saw it, but that he helped the world to see it, and so to disengage itself from many superstitions, will be regarded as one of the mightiest achievements of his long and useful life.

It is perhaps true that Mr. Campbell and the Disciples have made no great original contribution to what is properly known as theology. Our mission under God has not lain in that particular direction. The apostles of Jesus Christ were scarcely theologians in our modern acceptance of the term, though their teaching contains the germs of all the true theology which the world has ever had. They did not trouble themselves over the nice distinctions, which theology seeks, often vainly to settle. They thought in concrete rather than abstract forms. They were concerned not so much about establishing "doctrines," as about saving the souls of men. They were preachers of Christ's gospel to a lost world, not theological professors, working in a realm of abstractions. I do not underestimate the work of the theologian; I magnify that of the preacher. God sends the preacher; the theologian too often sends himself. The gospel was before the-

ology, and it is better than theology. The teacher of "doctrines" may sometimes help us; but oftener, perhaps, he misleads and confuses us. What the sinner needs, above all things, is to have Christ brought intelligently to his heart. The highest knowledge in divine things is to know how to bring saving truth to the understandings and consciences of men. In this direction, mainly, have we found our work. There is no egotism whatever in saying that the popular gospel proclamation has been vastly clarified through our instrumentality. Our influence extends very far outside the bounds of our personal labors, and has reacted upon every orthodox sect in Christendom. This is no idle boast, though men like Mr. W. may scoff at it. More than any other people known to me, the Baptists have profited by our labors. They may not choose to acknowledge the fact, but it is none the less a fact on that account. The Baptist pulpit is not what it was fifty years ago. It is scarcely necessary to say this to those who are able to recall the days when more than half the Associated Baptists in the West were anti-missionaries, if not thorough antinomians. I know what I am talking about, and the Whitsitts may just as well listen patiently. The change is undeniable. The entire credit of it, of course, is not to be given to the Disciples; neither do they claim it. But Baptist "experiences" are not what they used te be; and for whatever good effects have

been wrought at this particular point, they are largely indebted to the Disciples. Certainly we allow somewhat of the change to the general growth of intelligence in their own ministry and people, but even here the Disciples have helped them far more than they are willing to confess.

But to get back to theology. The question whether regeneration—meaning thereby change of heart—is before faith, or through faith, is the chief theological issue we make with the denominations of our time. Other questions are subordinate to this, or are involved in this. The order of the Calvinist is:

(1) Regeneration; (2) Repentance; (3) Faith; (4) Turning to the Lord.

The order of the Armenian is:

(1) Prevenient, or enabling grace; (2) Repentance and seeking the Lord; (3) Faith and regeneration; (4) Turning to the Lord.

The order of the New Testament is:

(1) The intelligent and hearty belief of the gospel; (2) Repentance *upon* (*epi*) the name of Jesus Christ; (3) The actual turning to God; (*i. e.*, In confession of Christ and baptism, and thereafter in obedience to all our Lord's commandments.)

In this last arrangement, repentance is given as equivalent to change of heart, as it is indeed the New Testament designation of it. Such a reconstruction as is here implied, when it has been firmly accomplished in the popular mind, will put

the gospel message into harmony with the entire New Testament representation, and also into accord with right reason, as disclosed in the inexorable laws of human thought and experience. A reformation of the Fullerism and Baptism of our time must take place, or its days are as certainly numbered (whether many or few) as truth and rationality are destined to triumph over an obstinate adherence to antiquated errors and superstitions. The question returns therefore:

Is regeneration (change of heart) *before* faith, or *through* faith? Does grace win men to God *through the truth believed*? Or, is "a holy principle implanted" before faith, and without the instrumentality of the Gospel? What do you say?

Mr. Whitsitt is not the first Baptist scribe who has imagined that he discovered a connection between the views of A. Campbell and those of Sandeman and the Haldanes. If no more than this had been asserted, the matter need have attracted little notice, or none at all. I have already said that traces of such an influence are observable; and I add here, chiefly in the earlier stages of Mr. Campbell's career, though it is not intended to deny that he received some permanent impressions from such sources. The point, however is this: whatever real indebtedness there was in the case, has always been an open fact among the Disciples, and there was never on Mr. Campbell's part, or on theirs, the least effort, or even wish, to conceal it.

Mr. Whitsitt has discovered nothing. He has revived a campaign trick which originated in the days of the Christian Baptist, and received from Mr. C. himself such attention as he thought it deserved. The only strange thing in the matter is that our doughty professor should have known so little of our history as to imagine that the resemblances in some minor matters which have come to his knowledge in the course of his historical studies, had never attracted the attention of any one else. In the third volume of the Christian Baptist, page 227 (Burnett's edition) may be found a letter to Mr. Campbell from Rev. R. B. Semple, a distinguished Baptist of that day, and immediately following it Mr. Campbell's reply. It suits our purpose here to make some extracts from these rather ancient documents.

Dr. Semple begins with a personal compliment to Mr. Campbell. "Your preaching," he says, "reminds me of Apollos, who displayed, as we moderns say, great talents, or as the Scripture says, was an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures." But even Apollos submitted to be taught in the way of God more perfectly, and so Dr. S. hopes he may be able to do a like service for Mr. Campbell. "So far as I can judge," he continues, "by your writings or preachings, you are substantially a Sandemanian or Haldanian. I know you differ from them in some points, but in substance you occupy their ground. Now I am

not about to fall out with them as heretics of the black sort. I think they have many excellent things among them, things I would gladly see more prevalent among us. But in some respects they are far from pure Christianity." He then proceeds to state the counts in his indictment. "Forbearance," he tells us, "is certainly a Christian grace strongly recommended both by precept and example, in the word of God." But in this Christian grace of forbearance, Dr. S. found the Haldanians greatly deficient. He did not regard them as altogether destitute of it, but "they limited its exercise to too narrow bounds." In all church decisions they demanded unanimity; all must think alike. This, Mr. S. regarded as impossible. Men will differ in opinion, and forbearance becomes a necessity. "Among the Haldanians, judging," he says, "from their writings, a gentle spirit is rarely to be found." He considered Mr. Campbell also as conspicuously faulty in this respect. He distinguishes between his writings and his personal bearing in private circles. In such circles he found him, "as a man, mild, pleasant and affectionate;" but his writings "were rigid and satirical beyond all the bounds of Scripture allowance." He regards the Christian Baptist as strikingly deficient in a New Testament spirit.

Touching Mr. Campbell's views, he says, "On some other points, I think they are dangerous, unless you are misunderstood; such as casting off

the Old Testament, exploding experimental religion in its common acceptation, denying the existence of gifts in the present day, commonly believed to exist among all spiritual Christians, such as preaching, etc. Some other of your opinions, though true, are pushed to extremes, such as those upon the use of creeds, confessions, etc., etc."

"In short," he presently adds, "your views are generally so contrary to those of the Baptists in general, that if a party were to go fully into the practice of your principles, I should say a new sect had sprung up, radically different from the Baptists as they now are."

It is not necessary that I should stop to point out the crudeness of Dr. Semple's representation of Mr. Campbell's spirit and aims. It is the fate of every new movement to be misunderstood, and often to be intentionally misrepresented. Of the latter, Dr. S. must be wholly acquitted. Mr. C. always entertained the highest personal regard for him. But he apprehended the new plea imperfectly. This, perhaps, was inevitable, and no one is less disposed than the writer of this review to fight over again the battles of the past, wherever it is clear that they grew out of mere mistakes of the understanding. But touching the question of dependence upon Sandeman and the Haldanes, we shall hear Mr. Campbell himself. I must be allowed to quote at some length:

"You say: 'So far as I can judge by your writ-

ings and preaching, you are substantially a Sandemanian or Haldanian.' This is substantially affirmed of me by many who have never seen nor read one volume of the writings of Sandeman or Haldane; and with the majority it has great weight, who attach to these names something as heretical and damnable as the tenets of Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans. I have not myself ever read all the works of these men, but I have read more of them than I approve, and more of them than they who impute to me their opinions as heresy." . . . "Concerning Sandeman and Haldane, how they can be associated under one species, is to me a matter of surprise. The former a Pedo-Baptist, the latter a Baptist; the former as keen, as sharp, as censorious, as acrimonious as Juvenal; the latter as mild, as charitable, as condescending as any man this age has produced. As authors I know them well. The one is like a mountain-storm that roars among the cliffs; the other like the balmy zephyrs that breathe upon banks of violets. That their views were the same on some points is as true as that Luther, Calvin and Wesley agreed in many points.

"I was once puzzled on the subject of Hervey's dialogues; I mean his Theron and Aspasio. I appropriated one winter season for examining this subject. I assembled all the leading writers of that day on these subjects. I laid before me Robert Sandeman, Hervey, Marshall, Bellamy, Glass,

Cudworth, and others of minor fame in this controversy. I not only read, but studied and wrote off in miniature their respective views. I had Paul and Peter, James and John, on the same table; I took nothing upon trust. I do not care for the authority, reputation, or standing of one of the systems, a grain of sand. I never weighed the consequences of embracing any one of the systems as affecting my standing or reputation in the world. Truth—not who says so—was my sole object. I found much entertainment in the investigation. And I will not blush, nor do I fear, to say, that in the controversy, Sandeman was like a giant among dwarfs. He was like Samson with the gates and posts of Gaza upon his shoulders. I was the most prejudiced against him, and the most in favor of Hervey, when I commenced this course of reading. Yet I now believe that not one of them was exactly on the track of the apostles. I have also read Fuller's strictures on Sandemanianism, which I suppose to be the medium of most of the information possessed on that subject in this country. This is the poorest performance Andrew Fuller ever gave the world."——"And the fact is (which he indirectly acknowledges) that Andrew Fuller was indebted more to John Glass and Robert Sandeman than to any two men in Britain for the best part of his views. I will not pause to inquire whether he wrote those strictures to save himself from the obloquy of being called a

Sandemanian, as some conjecture, or whether he wrote them to give a blow to Archibald M'Lean of Edinburg, who had driven him from the arena some years before; but I will say it is a very poor production, and proves nothing that either Robert Sandeman or Archibald M'Lean felt any concern in opposing."

Mr. C. further says, "that while he was well acquainted with all this controversy, and while he acknowledged himself debtor to Glass, Sandeman, Hervey, Cudworth, Fuller and M'Lean, as much as to Luther, Calvin and John Wesley, he candidly and unequivocally avowed that he did not believe any one of them had a clear and consistent view of the Christian religion as a whole."

Still further, he continues: "While I thus acknowledge myself a debtor to those persons, I must say that the debt, in most instances, is a very small one. I am indebted, upon the whole, as much to their errors as to their virtues, for these have been to me as beacons to the mariner, who might otherwise have run upon the rocks and shoals. * * * For the last ten years I have not looked into the works of any of these men, and have lost the taste which I once had for controversial reading of this sort. And during this period my inquiries into the Christian religion have been almost exclusively confined to the Scriptures. * * * I call no man master upon the earth; and although my own father has been a

diligent student and teacher of the Christian religion since his youth, and, in my opinion, understands this book as well as any person with whom I am acquainted, yet there is no man with whom I have debated more, and reasoned more than he. I have been so long disciplined in the school of free inquiry, that if I know my own mind, there is not a man upon the earth whose authority can influence me any further than he comes with the authority of evidence, reason and truth."

The ring of these sentences is very clear. There is no affectation, not the least, of concealment. Indebtedness—such as really existed—is frankly acknowledged; yet the narrow limitations of such indebtedness—a fact which is as certain as the other—is distinctly affirmed.

In the Christian Baptist (Vol. V. Page 398-400), may be found another letter from Dr. Semple, with another reply from Mr. Campbell. It seems that some one writing in the *Baptist Recorder* over the signature of Querens, desired to see Dr. S. enter the lists as a debater against Mr. Campbell's teaching. To this, the good doctor replied that there was no need of such a discussion. He says: "Mr. Campbell's views are not new, at least not many of them—Sandeman, Glass, the Haldanes were master spirits upon this system many years ago. And they were effectually answered by Fuller and others. * * * If I am called upon, then, to establish my assertions as to Mr. Camp-

bell's views, I refer Querens, and all such, to Fuller's work against Sandeman, &c. I do not know a word in it that I would alter." To this, Mr. Campbell responds as follows:

"Nor will it do to say that my views, or the cause which I advocate, has been already refuted by any other person. For this will not be satisfactory. To call me a Sandemanian or Haldanian, a Glassite, an Arian, or a Unitarian, and to tell the world that the Sandemanians, Haldanians, etc., etc., have done so and so, and have been refuted by such and such a person, is too cheap a method of maintaining human traditions, and too weak to oppose reason and revelation. You might as well nickname me a Sabellian, an Anthropomorphist, a Gnostic, a Nicolaitan, or an Anabaptist, as to palm upon me any of the above systems. *I do most unequivocally and sincerely renounce each and every one of these systems.* He that imputes any of these systems to me, and ranks me amongst the supporters of them, reproaches me. I do not by this mean to say that there are not in each and all these systems 'many excellent things,' as Bishop Semple himself once said of them." "Any one that is well read in these systems, must know that the *Christian Baptist* advocates a cause, and an order of things which not one of them embraced. I repeat, you have only to apply the golden rule to yourself in this instance, and ask yourself how you would like an opponent to call

you a Fullerite, a Hopkinsian, an Anabaptist, or something worse, in order to refute your sentiments, when you cordially renounce the systems laid to your charge."

In the above extract I have italicized, as the reader will notice, this one sentence: "I do most unequivocally and sincerely renounce each and every one of these systems." That this declaration was not only sincere on Mr. Campbell's part, but that it expressed the simple fact of his relation to these systems, will not be denied by any one who understands either the systems in question or the aims and principles of Mr. Campbell. And this in spite of any similarity in the use of phrases, such as "the ancient gospel," "the ancient order," etc., or any agreement in certain doctrinal aspects of these systems, which neither Mr. Campbell nor the Disciples have ever denied. The most fundamental conception in our movement, that which gave the mould and form to the whole of it, lies entirely outside, as we shall see presently, of all these systems. But meantime we need to pursue the present phase of our investigation a little further, before dismissing it entirely. Elder William Jones, of London, England, a name not unknown to fame, was a zealous Baptist of the Scotch, or Haldanian school. Between this gentleman and Mr. Campbell there occurred a noteworthy correspondence, parts of which bear immediately upon the subject now before us. Mr.

Jones seemed, for a time, to be greatly impressed with Mr. Campbell's work in America, and noticing certain features of it, did not hesitate to identify it, in essentials, with the system which he himself advocated. He speaks of the "Scotch Baptist churches"—addressing Mr. Campbell—"out of which yours in America took their origin, as I think you will not deny." He seems to feel that Mr. C. was scarcely willing to do justice to these Scotch Baptists, or to acknowledge the real extent of his indebtedness to them. He more than intimates the existence of some sort of vainglory, in the desire to appear more original than he really was. This desire, he thought, had led him to undervalue the work of Archibald M'Lean and his coadjutors, Braidwood, Ingles, Peddie, etc., etc., in the Scotch Baptist connexion. In this vein he wrote a long letter, which will be found in the *Millennial Harbinger*, for 1835, page 295. I need make no extracts from this letter. It is a spirited vindication of the Scotch Baptists, but betrays an utter inability to distinguish between them and the movement Mr. Campbell was leading in America. This, perhaps, should not be thought strange, since mere incidental resemblances in detail are often mistaken by thoughtless persons for identity in essential principles. Besides, Elder Jones' acquaintance with Mr. Campbell's writings was at this time very imperfect, and he was not nearly so anxious to claim kinship with him when he dis-

covered a disposition on Mr. C.'s part to treat somewhat irreverently the strict Calvinism of the communities whose cause he plead so earnestly. True, he repudiates "hyper-Calvinism," and says, "My recollection does not at this moment furnish me with the names of three individuals who are tinctured" with it. But, at the same time, Mr. Jones, if not a "hyper-Calvinist," was really a Calvinist of a very "strait" fashion, as the event clearly showed. This, however, would have made no difference with Mr. Campbell, as regards the matter of fellowship. The difference in this case came from the other side. And this single fact discloses, partially at least, the wide difference between the two systems. But I wish to quote briefly from Mr. Campbell's reply to Elder Jones' letter. I begin near the close of the 103d page:

"How much the reformation for which we plead is indebted to the labors of those revered fathers of the Scotch Baptist churches, I am not able to say. For my own part, I am greatly indebted to all the reformers, from Martin Luther down to John Wesley. I could not enumerate or particularize the individuals, living and dead, who have assisted in forming my mind. I am in some way indebted to some person or other for every idea I have on every subject. Dilworth and McCrae, with their spelling-books—Euclid, Locke, Bacon and Newton, and ten thousand others, cast an eye upon me."—"How many have, in the way of

moral causation, excited my mind to this train of reasoning, or to the examination of this fact or that incident, I am now, and will be while life lasts, wholly unable to say." * * * "I may therefore be indirectly indebted to Archibald M'Lean, for example, more than I am aware. A few years after my immersion, I read one volume of his tracts, and I don't know that I have ever read but his review of Wardlaw's Lectures, his Reply to Fuller, a Defense of Believer's Baptism, The Substance of two discourses on Faith, preached at Kingston-on-Hull, and a treatise on the Commission." * * "But while on this subject of originality, and the acknowledgment of literary and moral debts of thought, I soon found that our worthy friend M'Lean and the Edinburg school had drawn largely and liberally from the writings and labors of Robert Ferrier, Jas. Smith, John Glass, etc., that school which began its operations in 1728, about 40 years before the date of the Scotch Baptist churches." * * "This egotistic narrative is due to my Scotch and English brethren. I would have them know that we are in possession of all their knowledge, and thankfully acknowledge our debts to the great and wise and good men who have gone before us. I thank my Heavenly Father that I was born at the proper time, and on the best spot on the earth, and surrounded with the best set of circumstances to afford me the best religious education which the

19th century could furnish." And yet after all these acknowledgments, Mr. C. goes on to insist that he had "views of the Christian Institution *wholly new* as far as the works of all the schools to which he had alluded were concerned." It is scarcely worth while to say that these things wholly new, as regards these schools, were considered by Mr. C., and are now considered by all the Disciples, as the most fundamental and far-reaching features of his attempt to restore the apostolic gospel and institutions to the world. Nor can any well-informed man question this fact, unless his prejudices have gotten the better of his judgment. The resemblance to the Scotch Baptists is merely a coincidence in certain features, while the informing principle, the moulding and fashioning idea of the later movement is altogether different. We do not care to insist upon this fact, except to vindicate the truth of history and give honor to whom honor is due. We would just as soon trace our origin to the Scoth Baptists, or the Sandemanians, as to any other human source, if such were the case. Why should we care? The only question we ask is, What is truth? What is from God? We are concerned not a farthing as to who said a thing, or who before us has taught as we teach, till we get back to Christ and his apostles. The authority of Alexander Campbell sits as lightly upon our consciences as that of Fuller, or Gill, or Sandeman, when we find him contending against

right reason, or the word of God. "Sworn to no master, of no sect am I," is true of every man who clearly understands himself, as a Disciple of Jesus Christ. Nothing is truth to him, till he finds it in the oracles of God, so far as his religion is concerned. He may respect and love the great and good men who have gone before him, *but he believes in Jesus only.*

It is due to the memory of Mr. Campbell, that his personal testimony, concerning the matters treated of in this chapter, should be fairly and fully stated. It so happens that there is no lack of material for this purpose. In the Millennial Harbinger for 1848, will be found a series of articles devoted to these very questions. The first number of this series begins on page 279. I quote the following from page 280:

"The question has often been propounded to me —how came you by your present views of the Christian religion? Are they original or derived? If original, by what process of reason? If derived, from what authority or source? These are questions of but little consequence to any individual. The capital question is, *are they well founded?*"

To this, Mr. C. presently adds: "There are no new discoveries in Christianity. *Our whole religion, objectively and doctrinally considered, is found in a book.* Whatever in Christianity is new, is not true. Whatever is true, is contained in the commonly received and acknowledged books

of the Old and New Testaments, or Covenants." The whole question, he urges, "is one of interpretation." It has respect to what is written in these books. But still the question recurs:

"How were you led to interpret the Scriptures differently, and to teach and practice differently from what you once thought, and believed and practiced? Well, as these may be useful to others, I will answer the question by the narration of a few incidents, anecdotes and facts, some of which, never before published, may be of use to others, and lead them to a new mode of thinking and acting, as well as of enjoying the Christian religion."

It will be seen that the very question which furnishes the thesis for Prof. Whitsitt's book, is that which Mr. Campbell here sets himself to answer. He begins, of course, with what he regards as the essential starting point of his investigations, the point of his departure from the views in which he had been trained by his honored father, and the church of which he had been a member from his infancy. He does not deny his intellectual indebtedness to any one, orthodox or heterodox, Catholic or Protestant. His task is to give faithfully the lines along which his mind, as he devoutly believed, had been providentially led from first to last. This would answer the question which men were asking him; the very question, as I have said, which Mr. Whitsitt attempts to answer in his pre-

tentious little book. Where, then, does he place the initial movement of this whole process of study and development, which issued in the formation of the views, to the advocacy of which he gave the maturest and most fruitful years of his life? If a man wished to know the real answer to Prof. Whitsitt's question, here is the place to obtain it. All the essential facts are here given in a most straightforward and lucid way. There can be no excuse for ignorance in the matter at all. It is not said that no impression had been made upon his mind by Greville Ewing, or John Walker, or any one else, but as the real point of departure, as the initial impulse of all that he himself regarded as most characteristic in his conception of the Christian religion, he refers us to certain words which deeply impressed him, and set his mind to work in an entirely new direction. I still quote from the *Harbinger*, as above, page 280:

"The first *proof-sheet* that I ever read was a form of MY FATHER'S DECLARATION AND ADDRESS in press in Washington, Pennsylvania, on my arrival there in October, 1809. There were in it the following sentences: '*Nothing ought to be received into the faith* or worship of the church, or be made a term of communion amongst Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament. Nor ought anything to be admitted as of divine obligation, in the church constitution and management, but what is expressly enjoined by the authority

of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles upon the New Testament church; EITHER IN EXPRESS TERMS OR BY APPROVED PRECEDENT.'"

These words, be it noted, relate to the *constitution* of the church of Christ, to its principle of affiliation and bond of brotherhood. If they mean anything—and the man is queerly constituted who does not perceive their far-reaching import—they relate to what is fundamental in the church as a divine institution, and are, therefore, of the highest importance. These last words, Mr. Campbell says, "made a deep impression" on his mind. The attempt of Prof. Whitsitt to connect Alexander Campbell with the preparation of this address is entirely gratuitous, not to say impertinent. It is puerile if gravely held; as the device of an advocate, it is scarcely less than contemptible. Mr. Campbell speaks of these words as the words of his father. He expressly says, "*They made a deep impression on my mind.*" You must discredit utterly his own testimony before you can believe that he had anything to do with the putting of these words into the address. Mr. C. says there was "ambiguity about the 'approved precedent,' but none about 'express terms.'" These words became a study to him. He "reasoned with himself and others" on the matters involved in them. Like any man who sees for the first time the force of a great and fruitful generalization, his whole intellectual nature was quickened and

aroused. He "reasoned with himself and with others." This expression well indicates his absorption with the theme, and shows at the same time its causal relation to the whole development which followed. While these studies, these "reasonings with himself and others," were going on, he met with Rev. Mr. Riddle of the Presbyterian church, and introduced the matter to him. But Mr. Riddle, admitting the words in question to be plausible, pronounced them unsound. "If you follow them out," said he, "you must become a Baptist." This was well said. But there was more in these words than mere Baptistism, as distinguished from Presbyterianism. And it was this excess of meaning beyond the baptismal question which was the secret of their absorbing interest to Mr. C., for it appears that he had not yet weighed their bearing on that particular controversy. His father, who had written the address, had not suspected the conclusion wrapped up in his own formula. Like many another man, he was providentially "building wiser than he knew," as the sequel clearly proved. "What," said Mr. C., in response to Mr. Riddle, "is there no express precept for, nor precedent of, infant baptism in the Scriptures?" Doctor Riddle said, "Not one." Mr. Campbell says, "I was startled." "Turning to Mr. Andrew Monroe, the principal bookseller of Jefferson College, Cannonsburg, Pa., I said, 'send me, if you please, forthwith, all the treatises you

have in favor of infant baptism.'" The treatises were sent. And here began, unexpectedly, as the circumstances show, the studies which ended in the immersion of the Campbells, and the formation of the church at Brush Run, Pennsylvania, on the foundation divinely ordained by our Lord Jesus Christ. The account of this matter given in Prof. Whitsitt's book, (ch. viii) is a miserable perversion of the facts. A careful manipulation of extracts from Dr. Richardson's Life of Campbell, skillfully interwoven with suggestive inventions from his own brain, imparts an appearance of plausibility to a story which wrongs the Campbells, and leaves our author without the slightest claim to the character of an impartial historian. It is a conspicuous example of what is, alas! too common —viz: perversion of history to serve the purpose of a party. Fair-minded Baptists have affirmed as much, and it is greatly to their credit that they have done so.*

Mr. Campbell says he never inquired for anything on the Baptist side. He was impressed with the idea that they were an ignorant people, and had no thought of deriving assistance from such a source. He had read John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, but knew not that he was a Baptist. It is not strange that Mr. C. should have had such an impression regarding the Baptists of that day. It is doubtful whether one young man in a hun-

*See Appendix.

dred of Presbyterian raising had a different view. Besides, the Baptists were not then the educated people they are now. They had had men of distinction among themselves, but even their ablest men had won little recognition among the Pedo-Baptist sects. All the members of "the Washington Christian Association" were Presbyterians, and hostile to Baptist views. Mr. C. says expressly that he "was better pleased with Presbyterianism than anything else, and desired, if possible, to maintain it." (Har. p. 281). His study of the books sent him did not impress him at all favorably. Indignant at their "assumptions and fallacious reasonings," he threw them aside in disgust, and fled to his Greek New Testament with a hope of finding something more satisfactory. But here he found no resting-place for the sole of his foot. He went to his father for help. It was a question of "precept and precedent," of course. It was from this point of view his inquiries had begun, and his investigations had undoubtedly taken that direction throughout. His father conceded the whole ground as to the precept or precedent for infant baptism, but, "strange to tell," says the son, "took the ground that once in the church, and participants of the Lord's Supper, we could not 'unchurch or paganize ourselves'—and commence again as would a heathen man and a publican." (H. p. 281). They went into discussion. The father admitted that they ought not to teach

or practice infant baptism without divine authority, that they ought to practice only the apostolic baptism, but insisted that they ought not to unchristianize themselves after having professed and preached the Christian faith, and participated in its most solemn ordinances. This and kindred questions were discussed for "many months." Finally the end came. Alexander told his father —he says "with great reluctance"—that he dissented from all his reasonings upon the subject, and that he must be baptized. He was now fully satisfied, as he expressly tells us, that he had never been baptized, and to have hesitated, would have been to be untrue to his deliberate convictions. It was doubtless a great struggle, but Alexander Campbell was not the sort of a man that hesitates long, when Scripture and conscience demand a forward movement, at whatever cost of cherished memories and affections. What his father might do, what other dear friends might do, he knew not. The decision made was by himself, and for himself alone. The baptism accordingly took place, but "greatly to his gratification," his father and sister, his wife, and several others went with him. He had stipulated with Elder Luce, the administrator, that he should be baptized upon the New Testament confession of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. Perhaps Prof. Whitsitt would regard this scrupulous adherence to the scriptural formula of profession as

a specimen of Sandemanian "literalism," but he does not intimate that it was a slavish following of Sandemanian precedent. He says indeed that it was stipulated that the baptism "should be performed *into the name* of the Father, etc., and not *in the name*, as was then, and now is usual among the Regular Baptists." This, he tells us, was "in due subjection to the authority of Archibald M'Lean." Does Prof. Whitsitt intend to be understood as taking position against this rendering of the commission? Of course he does not. What then can save his statement from classification with the characteristic devices of all demagogues? Verily, the wily and unscrupulous leaders of our partisan politics are not the only demagogues in the world.

The baptism of the Campbells took place on the 12th day of June, 1812. In his usual sneering manner, Mr. Whitsitt says that "during the period between the year 1812 and 1820, Alexander relapsed into a condition of mere vegetation." Vegetation, forsooth! There is every reason to believe that this was one of the most important periods of his life, the period pre-eminently in which the great germinal principles that shaped the thought and work of his whole life were becoming distinctly formed in his mind. Concerning this very period, Mr. C. writes—Harbinger 1848 P. 344—"The position of baptism itself to the other institutions of Christ became a new subject of examin-

ation, and a very absorbing one. A change of any one's views in any radical matter in all its practical bearings and effects upon all his views, not only in reference to that simple result, but also in reference to all its connections with the whole system of which it is a part, is not to be computed *a priori*, by himself or any one else." The change of his views on baptism, according to Mr. C. himself, was the beginning of a most careful study of the whole Christian religion from the standpoint of the advance already made. "I must know now two things about everything—its *cause* and its *relations*. Hence my mind was for a time set loose from all its moorings. It was not a simple change of views on baptism, which happens a thousand times without anything more, but a *new commencement*. I was placed on a new eminence —a new peak of the mountain of God, from which the whole landscape of Christianty presented itself to my mind in a new attitude and position." "Mere vegetation," indeed! Did Paul "relapse into a condition of mere vegetation" during that mysterious sojourn in Arabia after his conversion? Perhaps Prof. Whitsitt thinks so; and if he were writing a caricature of the apostle's life, instead of Alexander Campbell's, it would be exactly like him to say so. Paul has nowhere given in detail the processes of elaboration and adjustment through which his mind had struggled into the full light of the gospel, but that he had such an

experience of the gradual opening up of the truth to his soul cannot be doubted. A great intellect like Paul's must have time to take its bearings, and shape the outline of its activities in the new field of sacrifice and toil, which now lay before him. Paul did not "vegetate;" nor did Alexander Campbell. Neither of them was that sort of man.

Prof. Whitsitt speaks very slightingly of Mr. Campbell's sermon on The Law, delivered in 1816, in the very midst of the period designated as one of "mere vegetation"—doubtless because there is nothing in it (although he more than insinuates the contrary) which tends to strengthen the thesis which he has undertaken to prove. If he had really wished to follow Mr. Campbell along the lines of his actual growth in divine knowledge, he would not have passed over this memorable discourse so lightly. The fact is, that, more than anything else in our possession, this sermon indicates the true nature of the revolution which was going on in his mind. The germs indeed of very much of the most characteristic teaching of his life are contained in it. The clear, comprehensive and fruitful distinction between the old and new Covenants, between Christianity and Judaism, between the law and the gospel, which did so much to shape the whole movement of the Disciples, is here fully propounded and convincingly argued. And so far away is the general tenor of the dis-

course from the fixed grooves of Sandemanian theology, that so distinguished a leader of the Scotch Baptists as Elder William Jones of London—a Sandemanian, as Prof. Whitsitt would say, of the Immersion observance—boldly rejected it as downright Antinomianism. Criticising an article in The *Christian Baptist* of exactly the same purport, he says:

"Here is a strange affair indeed; Mr. Campbell, who exhibits the Scotch Baptists" (Sandemanians, according to Prof. Whitsitt, of the immersion observance) "of this country as being 'fettered and manacled and paralyzed by the stays of Hyper-Calvinism,' is himself found chiming in with the Hyper-Calvinists, the only party on this side the Atlantic that has the least hesitation in admitting the perpetual obligation of the Decalogue, and on a point too in which the Scotch Baptist churches are firmly agreed in opposing both. *On this point you are quite out of our camp, and we find you in that of our enemies.*"—Harbinger—1835. Page 540.

This extract, as I have said, is part of Elder Jones' comment upon an article to the same effect as the sermon on The Law to which our Professor refers in a semi-contemptuous vein. But as a matter of fact this sermon demonstrates that Mr. Campbell's mind was not only moving in directions wholly unsuggested by those teachers whom Prof. Whitsitt represents him as slavishly fol-

lowing, but oftentimes reaching conclusions utterly opposed to their most fundamental ideas. This will not be questioned, I believe, by any candid person acquainted with all the facts. That my readers may see clearly what fruitful germs are contained in this sermon, I give the following extracts: "Now, is it not most obvious that this text (Gal. iii: 24) and context, instead of countenancing law-preaching, condemn it? The scope of it is to show that whatever use the law served as a schoolmaster previous to Christ, it no longer serves that use. And now that Christ has come, we are no longer under it." * * * "Some, notwithstanding the plainness of this doctrine, may urge their own experience as contrary to it. It would, however, be as safe for Christians to make divine truth a test of their experience, and not their experience a test of divine truth. Some individuals have been awakened by the appearance of the Aurora Borealis, by an earthquake, by a thunder-storm, by a dream, by sickness, etc. How inconsistent for one of these to affirm from his own experience that others must be awakened in the same way! How incompatible with truth for others to preach such occurrences as preliminary to saving conversion!" . . . "A fourth conclusion which is deducible from the above premises is, that all arguments and motives, drawn from the law, or Old Testament, to urge the disciples of Christ to baptize their infants; to pay tithes to

their teachers; to observe holy days or religious fasts, as preparatory to the observance of the Lord's supper; to sanctify the seventh day; to enter into national covenants; to establish any form of religion by civil law;—and all reasons and motives borrowed from the Jewish law to excite the disciples of Christ to a compliance with, or imitation of, Jewish customs, are inconclusive, repugnant to Christianity, and fall ineffectual to the ground; *not being enjoined or countenanced by the Lord Jesus Christ.*"

This last sentence is the key-note to the entire sermon. The authority of Moses has been superseded. Everything stands or falls accordingly as it is supported or unsupported by Christ's authority. Nothing is binding now because Moses commanded it. Only the things of Moses which have been "repromulged" by Jesus Christ are binding on his disciples. Prof. Whitsitt may not think very highly of the doctrine of this sermon, but he can find no vestige of Sandemanianism in it. For all that, however, it follows very closely, if not "slavishly," one of Mr. Campbell's great leaders —the apostle to the Gentiles.

The year 1820, which is fixed by our Professor as the later limit of this assumed vegetation period, brings us to the debate with Mr. Walker, the Presbyterian, and to the beginning of Mr. Campbell's career as an author. The M'Calla debate and the *Christian Baptist* came in 1823, and

from that time on his whole public life was before the eyes of the world. Much that he wrote in the earlier years of his editorial activity must be taken as tentative rather than final. His mind was in the growing stage even yet, and the conclusions then reached often failed, no doubt, to command the assent of his judgment at a later period. It is always so in great mental revolutions. And the religious reformer must therefore be studied in the light of this inexorable law which shapes our progress in every sort of knowledge. To its operation there has been thus far no exception in human history.

CHAPTER V.

A MOST FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE.

Compared with the varieties of the Scottish Independent, whether Baptist or Pedo-Baptist, the history of the Disciples exhibits from the commencement a most striking difference. From the first step taken, the Campbells looked to the union of Christians as one special object of their labors. If they rejected human creeds, it was beause they were essentially schismatic in their tendencies. If they repudiated the jargon of scholasticism, it was that hindrances to Christian unity might be gotten out of the way. If they emphasized the simple features of the apostolic gospel, and church order, it was because they were firmly persuaded that the catholicity of our Lord's prayer (Jno. 17) could never be attained upon any complex doctrinal basis of human contrivance. If they would have no term of fellowship not enjoined by our Lord Jesus Christ, either in express precept, or by good, sound precedent, the reason was still the same. The restoration of the New Testament faith and polity was no doubt a thing to be sought on its own account, but the necessity of seeking it first became clear to them, when engaged in studying the conditions of spiritual and ecclesiastical fellowship. Abraham Lincoln once said, in sub-

stance: "My business is to preserve the Union. Whatever I do has reference to this one thing especially. If I set the slaves free, it will be to save the Union; if I can save the Union better without setting them free, then I shall not set them free. The one thing to be done is to save the Union." It was very much so with the Campbells. They had seen the evil of division. Sectism was to them a sin of no common magnitude. From this great sin they felt that our common Protestantism should be saved. It was at this point our movement began, and this end has never been lost sight of for a moment, in our whole history. It is impossible now that we should lose sight of it at any future period. We must ever pray in the words of our Lord; "that they may all be one, as the Father and the Son are one, to the end that the world may believe." We have always emphasized the importance of unity as no other Protestant community has done. And to-day, when it is fashionable to plead that Evangelical Protestantism has all the unity the Lord ever contemplated, our voice is still heard above the din and clamor of sects pleading in the Master's name for a union of disciples of which the only adequate measure is the oneness of God and his Son, Jesus Christ; a union which shall be outward and actual, so that the world may be constrained to believe in God's love, manifest through his Son, to our whole sinning and dying race. To urge this plea for Chris-

tian unity, as no other people is urging it, is one of the reasons of our existence; one of the reasons which shall justify our presence among the active forces of Christendom, in the day when God shall judge the world. Of this, we can no more doubt, than we can call in question the words of the Master upon which our faith is built.

The whole Scotch school of Independents, whether headed by Glass and Sandeman, or M'Lean and the Haldanes, overlooked this great question almost entirely. They sought *doctrinal* truth, as the one paramount object of all their investigations and discussions. I do not say that they lost sight of everything else absolutely, but I do say that their chief distinction was doctrinal and speculative. Of the scriptural basis of ecclesiastical fellowship and co-operation, they seem to have had no clear conception at all. To differ doctrinally on some hair-splitting abstraction, was to insure division and the formation of a new party. The sect-making tendency, which has been the bane of Protestantism from the days of Luther and Calvin, was pre-eminently the bane of Scotch Independency. They were born separatists, one and all. In the light of eternity, this will be the chief thing to be said against them. The Sandemanian errors regarding faith, for which they have had many hard things written about them in our time, will then appear to be venial blunders, compared with this more serious mistake. *Separation, with-*

out a justifying necessity in the sight of God, is a great sin.

From the inception of their work, the Campbells seem to have caught the true scriptural idea of ecclesiastical fellowship. They soon learned to distinguish broadly between the faith which saves men, and doctrinal beliefs which neither save nor condemn them. Between the belief with the heart that Jesus is the Christ, God's only begotten Son, and all the theological opinions which make up our various Protestant orthodoxies, they drew a broad, bold line, and made it ever thereafter ineffaceable. The faith that saves the soul, they said, is the faith which unites to God, and which should unite God's children to one another. The faith which God accepts, his church should accept also. If God cares not for our theological abstractions, however necessary they may seem to the symmetry of the doctrine of redemption, then we should not care for them. It is a sin to require men to agree with us in matters wherein God does not require agreement with him. With this clear-cut, comprehensive, divine deliverance, the Campbells began. They saw many things, no doubt, as in a mirror, very obscurely, but this they saw with a clearness and distinctness, which, under the circumstances, was absolutely marvelous. No doubt others had denounced human creeds before they denounced them, and had talked about the Bible, as a sufficient rule in all matters of faith and life,

before they began their distinctive work as reformers. But the Campbells saw a reason for the repudiation of creeds which others had not seen. They perceived clearly that when used as bonds of fellowship, they rendered the unity of the church an absolute impossibility. There is not a denominational creed in Christendom that does not contain in it dogmatic utterances which lie outside the limits of the common faith—the faith which a man must have, or it is written against him: "He that believeth not shall be condemned." This common faith which all Christians have—which a man must have before he can become a Christian—was the faith-basis of the whole church of God, in the New Testament times. In those days, the one common formula of Christian profession was that which had been divinely ordained —"I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Arianism and Athanasianism were yet unknown. Augustinianism and Pelagianism had not been heard of. Calvinism and Arminianism lay concealed in the womb of the far-away centuries. Mind, we do not object to the formulation of individual beliefs. And if a company of Christian believers should wish to give expression to their theological ideas for general information, we do not say there would be any harm in it. From the days of the Campbells the distinction between such expressions of opinion and the creed-made tests of ecclesiastical fellowship in use throughout

our modern Christendom, has been clearly and distinctly drawn. The publication of my individual opinions, simply as my opinions, can harm no one, but the dogmatic proclamation of such opinions as a basis of fellowship and church co-operation, is an impertinence in the eyes of God and all thoroughly instructed Christian men. The difference here is open and palpable, and any pretended failure to see it is without excuse. A theological development, more or less elaborate, from the great germinal ideas of the New Testament was to be expected—was, indeed, according to the fixed laws of human thought, inevitable. It is not against theology, as such, that our movement is a protest. Theology in itself is well enough. Of course, where there are contradictions in theology there must be error, as well as truth. But all theology is not error. Our point is this: The unity of believers in one spiritual organism, or fellowship was, beyond doubt or denial, the archetypal conception of the church in the mind of the Redeemer. No man uncommitted to the advocacy of a sect, it is perfectly safe to say, can object to this statement.

But is this divine ideal of the dear Lord a practical one? Or is it purely visionary, never to be realized in the church's history? Everything depends on the answer to this question. Mind, I do not ask whether, under the ordinary laws of human thought and association, it has been a

practical ideal in the times which are gone, but is it an ideal that we may expect to see historically realized under God's gracious administration, at any time this side the jugdment day? Our movement implies the possibility, under God, of a united church. Nay, more; it implies the hope, the confident persuasion, grounded in Scripture, that the prayer of the Lord Jesus will be realized before the church's mission is accomplished; before the world shall have been converted to Christ. The Papacy maintains, after a sort, an outward unity which the whole world recognizes. But the Papacy is a spiritual despotism. The individual is lost in the collective organization. The Hierarchy controls everything. Free, honest investigation for truth's sake, for salvation's sake even, is not to be thought of. The church—that is, the priesthood—does all the thinking which is needed. The individual, even though he be a priest, is mentally a serf. But Protestantism affirms man's spiritual birthright, in Christ. It sets before us an open Bible, and bids us seek truth for ourselves. This is its crown of glory for all the ages. But is division the price of this freedom? Is our modern denominationalism the best that is possible on the Protestant principle of the right of private judgment? If such be the case, I do not say we are purchasing our spiritual enfranchisement at too great a cost—for what equivalent is there for the soul's freedom—but this I say, I do not be-

lieve that such is the fact in the case. It is impossible that such can be the case. If Protestantism, in its fundamental idea, be of God, then it does not make our Lord's intercessory prayer an impossibility. But where then is the seat of the trouble, whose existence it were madness to deny? I answer: In the mistake made by the sixteenth century reformers touching the law of affiliation, or bond of fellowship, in the church of God. The New Testament faith-basis has been rejected, and in its place has been substituted, everywhere, a body more or less complete, of theological opinion. Every Protestant denomination on earth is an example of such rejection and substitution. The theological articles of faith—so called—differentiate the parties, and measure the extent of theological divergence between them. But is there not, it may be asked, beneath all this diversity of the evangelical denominations, a deeper and most real unity? the unity for which the Lord prayed? To the first question we answer, yes. To the second question, no. There is a real, vital union, certainly, between all Christians, but any union which is not actual, historical, and therefore outward, is not an adequate fulfillment of the Lord's prayer. Remember, Jesus says, "I pray that they may all be one, as we are one, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Now, sect-strife, more than anything else, hinders the world's conversion to Christ. It is so here at home. It is

doubly so in heathen lands abroad. This question is coming home to us more and more. We must face it, whether we wish to do so or not. What our missionaries among the heathen are learning to-day, the Lord Jesus saw, through the vistas of twenty centuries, from the very beginning. No; the Lord's people are not one in the sense of his prayer. This is absolutely certain. They will never be one in that sense until "the rock" upon which he built his church is restored to its proper place. But this is objected to. Our Lord's idea, we are told, was that of unity in diversity. Now it must be admitted that "unity in diversity" is a happy phrase, and that it may be used to express a great truth. Only let us beware that we do not employ it to conceal a great falsehood! It must be plain to every man of sense, that no unity of Christians other than one which is consistent with a certain sort of diversity is at all possible. In theological tenets, Christian men need never expect absolute agreement. It was not so in the beginning, and it is safe to say it never will be. But in faith, saving faith, by universal consent, Christians are, and must ever be, one. Nothing is plainer, therefore, than the fact, that so far as faith is concerned, here is a sufficient basis for a unity both spiritual and ecclesiastical. It will be sufficient, if we require, as a condition of fellowship with us, precisely the same *faith* which God requires as a condition of fellowship with

him. Nay, more; is it not at our peril that we require anything else? I judge no one; but certainly there is a day of reckoning to come. Judgment is to begin at the house of God.

Now, of these things, the Campbells seem to have had an unusually clear understanding from a very early period in their work. Something like this discloses itself in the first tentative beginnings in the "Christian Association." It grows clearer at each successive step. Along this line God was leading them. Slowly the wide field is opened up before them, and the progress, upon the whole, is steady in the direction of the first forward outlook. The final expression of this great feature in our history is, perhaps, nowhere better put than by Mr. Campbell in his debate with Dr. N. L. Rice, at Lexington, Ky.:

"So is it in our most holy faith. There are but two grand principles in Christianity, two laws revealed and developed, whose combination produces similar harmony, beauty, and loveliness in the world of mind as (the centripetal and centrifugal forces) in the world of matter. I must at once declare the simplicity of this divine constitution of remedial mercy. It has but three grand ideas peculiar to itself; and these all concern the King. I am sorry that this mysterious and sublime simplicity does not appear to those who set about making constitutions for Christ's kingdom. This confession of omnipotent moral power, because the

offspring of infinite wisdom and benevolence, must be learned from one passage, Matt. 16, "Who do men say that I am?" We must advance one step further—who say *you* that I am? Peter in one momentous period expressed the whole affair—'THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD.' The two ideas expressed, concern the *person* of the Messiah and his *office.* The one implied concerns his *character;* for it was through his character, as developed, that Peter recognized his person and his Messiahship. Now, let us take the shoes from off our feet, for we stand on holy ground. 'Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonas; flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father, who is in heaven. And I say unto thee, thou art Peter (a stone) and on THIS ROCK I will build MY CHURCH, and the gates of hell (hades) shall not prevail against it.' It will stand forever. 'I will give unto thee (thyself alone, Peter,) the keys of the kingdom of heaven (my church), and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.' Here, then, is the whole revelation of the mystery of the Christian constitution. The full confession of the Christian faith. All that is peculiar to Christianity, is found in these words; not merely in embryo, but in a clearly expressed outline. A clear perception, and a cordial belief of these two facts will make any man a Christian.

He may carry them out in their vast dimensions and glorious developments, to all eternity. He may ponder upon them until his spirit is transformed into the image of God; until he shines in more than angelic brightness, in all the purity and beauty of heavenly love. Man glorified in heaven, gifted with immortality, and rapt in the ecstacies of eternal blessedness, is but the mere result of a proper apprehension of, and conformity to, this confession. I am always overwhelmed with astonishment in observing how this document has been disparaged and set at naught by our builders of churches. Yet Jesus calls it *the rock*. It is in a figure of a church or a temple, the foundation, *the rock*. When all societies build on this one foundation, and on it only, then there shall be unity of faith, of affection, and of co-operation; but never till then. Every other foundation is sand. Hence they have all wasted away. Innumerable parties have perished from the earth; and so will all the present, built on any other foundation than this rock. * * * Their doom is written, 'Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'" (C. and R. Debate, page 422).

From this masterly statement I would gladly quote more; but space forbids. Whoever confesses Jesus, as above described, receiving him in his heart as Messiah and Savior, and then, because he has so received him, is baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, becomes

thereby a member of the church of God, and is so owned and approved in heaven; not only so, is thereby entitled to be so owned and approved in every congregation or local church of God on earth. This is the beginning. A life so begun, and continued in faithful conformity to Christ's life, till the end comes, is sure to be approved of God in the judgment. This faith and life constitute the New Testament law of affiliation, the one divine bond of Christian and church fellowship, ordained by Jesus Christ, till he comes to judge the world. Of some things a man may not feel sure. Of this we are as sure as we are that the only name in which men can be saved is the name of Jesus. Every deviation from this law of divine brotherhood and co-operation is outside the divine charter, and is doomed to failure in the future, as it has failed in the past. This the Campbells clearly saw, and this the Sandemanians and Scotch Baptists, like all other parties, utterly failed to see. If there were nothing else to be said to their honor, there is enough in this single restoration of the primitive ideal to insure to them the reverent regard of true men in all the ages to come.

CHAPTER VI.

CERTAIN MATTERS OF DETAIL.

Prof. Whitsitt, without a word of authority from any source, seeks to make the impression that the course of Thomas Campbell in America, was really inspired by Alexander, while he was yet in Glasgow, Scotland. I call attention to the following extract, as a specimen:

"From the letter of protest that was addressed by Mr. Campbell to that body, (the Associate Synod of North America), it may be gathered that the objections urged against him related to the usual Sandemanian scruples concerning the impropriety of any human standards of belief, and to his advocacy of the customary Sandemanian position that the Scriptures are the only admissible standard, to the exclusion of all kinds of creeds and confessions of faith. Here was the earliest, if not the most brilliant, conquest which Alexander was enabled to make on behalf of Sandemanianism." Page 65, 6.

This intimation of an influence exerted, first upon Alexander Campbell by Greville Ewing, and then upon Thomas Campbell through his son, need not be noticed here, further than to say that there is no shadow of foundation for it anywhere outside Prof. W.'s own imagination. Not only is it

without authority, the facts are against it. The younger Campbell was in Glasgow, busily pursuing his studies in the University, being at the same time charged with the care of his father's family. How should he find time to communicate a programme of reformation to his father in America? It is an idle conceit, unworthy of a Professor in a Baptist Theological School, and incredible to any body but mere partisans. But Thomas Campbell, it seems, was following in the track of the Sandemanians, however we may account for it. Prof. Whitsittt is determined to have it so. *This is not true.* Were the Sandemanians the only people, who about that time, began to speak words of protest against the despotism of creeds? By no means. The Baptists in England, not less than their brethren in Scotland, were no advocates of creeds. To this day, they refuse to be bound by them; in spite, too, of the great influence of their greatest preacher. The roof under which English Baptists assemble for co-operative work must be broad enough to shelter the different schools of doctrine into which the Baptists of the United Kingdom are divided. It has always been so, as we shall see further along. But will our Professor himself contend for "any standards of belief" other than the Scriptures? Have American Baptists any such "standard!" Standard is our Professor's own word. To have scruples about the use of "human standards" of belief, he regards

as proof of Sandemanian heresy! If this is so, let our Baptist brethren cease prating about their fidelity to the Bible as "the only standard."

But Thomas Campbell's position, as against creeds, was no mere vague war-cry, or "glittering generality." He clearly defined what he meant by taking the Bible as the only "standard." Sandemanians and Scotch Baptists inveighed against creeds, but themselves followed the creed-principle. Prof. Whitsitt knows full well that a creed does not need to be written. These parties made their unwritten articles a test of church fellowship, no less exactingly than other sects their written creeds. This can not be denied. It is this which explains their separatistic fecundity. But Thomas Campbell began by guarding against separatism, as far as anything can be guarded against in this imperfect human world. Nothing ought to be made A TEST OF FELLOWSHIP, said he, which is not enjoined by our Lord Jesus Christ; either *in express precept* or by *good and valid precedent.* This is what taking the Bible as the only "standard" meant to him. This is not Sandemanianism, but apostolical Christianity. It came not from Greville Ewing or the Scotch Baptists, but from the New Testament. The first attempt to build on this foundation, thus clearly outlined, since the days of the early church, was made in this new world by Thomas and Alexander Campbell. Let him that denies, show his authority.

The Professor several times intimates that the Sandemanians (including of course the Scotch Baptists) denied any divine influence, outside the gospel testimony, in the production of faith. *This is not true.* It is a stale charge and ought not to be repeated by any writer who desires the respect of truth-loving men.

Touching this question, Robert Sandeman himself shall speak first. He is quoted as follows, by A. Campbell, in the Harbinger for 1835, p. 356.

"Two men may be employed with equal diligence in studying the Scriptures, and with equal seriousness in praying for divine assistance; the one may come to know the truth, and the other may grope in the dark all his life-time." Now if we admit this, why is it so? Here is the answer: "Faith comes not by any human endeavor, or the use of any means, even under the greatest advantages that men can enjoy: *but of that same sovereign good pleasure which provided the grand thing to be believed.*" Vol. 2, London, 1768, p. 191.

This is plain enough. Indeed it could not be otherwise, for Sandeman was a Calvinist, and Calvinism means the production of faith by the divine sovereignty.

Let Archibald M'Lean speak for the Scotch Baptists:

"This knowledge and belief of the truth as it is in Jesus, though a duty incumbent on all who

hear the gospel, is nevertheless THE SPECIAL GIFT OF GOD, being the effect of divine teaching by means of the word, and peculiar to the elect." Commission p. 72.

"The power of Jesus in giving sight to the blind man, made him instantly sensible that he saw, and left no room for reasoning on the subject; even so, when the import and evidence of the truth SHINES INTO THE HEART BY THE ENLIGHTENING SPIRIT, it has at once the double effect of *producing belief*, and the consciousness of it." Ibid. p. 82.

"The testimony of conscience will be more or less explicit, according to the degree of faith which is the subject of it; even as faith itself is weak or strong in proportion to the degree of light and evidence with which the gospel *by the Spirit shines into the mind*, which is the foundation of both. Ibid. p. 85.

Andrew Fuller himself testifies that these men believed in divine influence in order to faith. In his review of M'Lean, (Appendix to his Gospel Worthy, etc. p. 208) he writes as follows:

"That there is a divine influence on the soul, which is necessary to spiritual perception and belief, as being the cause of them, those with whom I am now reasoning will admit. *The only question is, in what order these things are caused?* Whether the Holy Spirit causes the mind, while carnal, to discern and believe spiritual things, and

thereby renders it spiritual; (the position of Sandeman and M'Lean); or whether he imparts a holy susceptibility, and relish for the truth, in consequence of which we discern its glory, and embrace it." "The latter," continues Fuller "appears to me to be the truth."

It is hard to have patience with those Baptist scribes, who not only misrepresent Sandeman, M'Lean and all the Scotch Baptists, but who are so ignorant of the writings of their own Fuller, as not to know that he concedes the truth which they are making bold to deny. Sandeman, M'Lean and Fuller were all Calvinists, and agreed that faith is possible only to the elect. They agreed further, as every man knows who knows anything about it, that saving or justifying faith *is the belief of the gospel;* or, to put it in Fuller's own words, "the persuasion of the truth of what God hath said." They agreed also that this *belief* or *persuasion* of the truth implies a *spiritual perception* of its relations to the soul's needs, and an acceptance of it, as free and full and adequate for the soul's salvation. They differed, as Fuller expressly says, about the order in which faith and regeneration are caused. Fuller thought faith was the effect of prior regeneration, and Sandeman, M'Lean and all that school, held that regeneration is the effect of faith. This was the gist of the whole controversy. To pretend to any thing else, is either to confess ignorance of the facts, or

to disregard them entirely. When Sandeman spoke of faith in connection with justification as "the bare belief of the bare truth," he only affirmed that justification is grounded, not upon a holiness of heart implied in believing, but upon the believing itself, as separated from that holiness which is the immediate effect of it. The same position has already been noticed in M'Lean's treatise on the Commission. Neither Sandeman or M'Lean thought of faith otherwise than as the "special gift of God," and dependent upon an exercise of divine sovereignty.

The general want of fairness which pervades Mr. Whitsitt's book may be indicated by a single quotation:

"In the year 1816, he was able to excite a small controversy by a discourse on "The Law," before the Redstone Association, where, in keeping with his Sandemanian principles, he thought the preaching of the gospel was sufficient to produce "the bare belief of the bare truth," and therefore maintained that it was unnecessary and reprehensible to persuade men by the terrors of the Lord."

Now, as a matter of fact, the phrase 'bare belief of the bare truth,' is not in the sermon on "The Law" referred to. Nor is anything said about faith, which implies such a conception of it. Besides, this sermon shows that Mr. Campbell's view of divine influence was then what is generally called

the orthodox view. A single quotation will prove this:

"The Christian dispensation is called 'the ministration of the Spirit,' and accordingly every thing in the salvation of the church is accomplished *by the immediate energy of the Spirit.*" "He was to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and judgment; *Not by applying the law of Moses, but the facts concerning Christ, to the consciences of the people.*" * * * "The Spirit *accompanying* the words which the apostles preached," (most orthodox phrase,) "would convince the world of sin, etc., * * * so that Christ, and not the law, was the Alpha and Omega of their sermons; and this the *Spirit made effectual* to the salvation of thousands."

The intimation that Mr. C., in this discourse, regarded the preaching of "the terrors of the Lord" as a reprehensible procedure, is also without a particle of foundation. The "terrors of the Lord" are far more clearly exhibited in the gospel, than they were under the law of Moses. And it is the preaching of "the law," instead of the gospel, as a means of conversion, that is specially reprobated in this sermon. How a Baptist editor —I do not now remember of what paper—could speak of the Professor's book as without a blunder in historical statement, must seem passing strange to all who have cared to acquaint themselves with the real history.

On page 76, Mr. W. quotes Dr. Richardson as saying that "before the family departed from Rich Hill, he had been much pleased with the works of Archibald M'Lean, especially his work on 'the commission' of which he was wont ever after to speak in the highest terms." "This incident," he says, "is important to the student of his life and changes." But, if "this incident" turns out to be spurious, then a link in the Professor's fantastic chain of historical caricature is lost forever. What Prof. Richardson really says, is this: "He *seems*, in addition, about this time to have read, and to have been much pleased with the works of Archibald M'Lean, especially his work on the commission, &c., &c." Dr. R. says he *seems* to have read. This, of course, is an expression of uncertainty; but it suits Mr. W's. whim to speak of it as absolute history. Now, there is the very best authority for saying that Dr. Richardson was, in this instance, mistaken. In a letter to Elder W. Jones, Scotch Baptist, of London, Mr. Campbell himself speaks of his first acquaintance with M'Lean's writings as follows:

"I may, therefore, indirectly be indebted to Archibald M'Lean, for example, much more than I am aware. A few years after my immersion, I read one volume of his tracts, and I do not know that I have ever read but his Review of Wardlaw's Lectures, his Reply to Fuller, a Defense of Believer's Baptism, The Substance of two Discourses

preached on Faith, at Kingston upon-Hull, and a Treatise on the Commission. Sometime after my separation from the Presbyterian connection and my immersion into the ancient faith, a Mr. Jno. Boyle, of Ireland, with whom I formed a slight acquaintance in Scotland, once an Episcopal parson, but then converted by Jno. Walker, of Dublin, to Separatism, made me a visit, and presented to me a volume of the above tracts, and *thus introduced me to a knowledge of the name of M' Lean.*" (M. H. 1835. P. 304).

From this, it is perfectly clear that, at the time of writing this letter to Eld. Jones, Mr. Campbell had no recollection of having read any thing from M'Lean at an earlier date than the one here mentioned. Dr. Richardson was therefore mistaken in his hypothetical conclusion referred to by Mr. Whitsitt; and the significant "incident," of which the latter makes so much, vanishes from history.

The following characteristic paragraph may excite a smile, or a frown, according to the momentary mood in which the reader shall chance to find himself:

"In case the representations made by Prof. Richardson are complete, the revolution which took place in Alexander's mind, by which he became a subject of Sandeman in the matter of faith, began in the month of October, 1811 (Vol. 1. P. 413), and was completed in the month of March, 1812 (Vol. 1, P. 422). In connection with it, he

carried forward a correspondence with his father, perhaps chiefly for the purpose of showing him deference. The harmless old gentleman was incapable of rendering him any assistance in his enterprises, but it was in his power to offer a deal of resistance in case he was not duly coddled and conciliated. As on every other occasion, Thomas Campbell played the role of a convenient echo. It is surprising to witness the readiness with which he could repeat at first blush such Sandemanian watch-words as 'the bare belief of the naked truth,' and affirm, against the convictions of a life-time, that this involuntary, unavoidable faith was sufficient to procure salvation." (Page 88).

The estimate here offered of the character and intellectual qualifications of the elder Campbell need cause no surprise to any one. It is not the judgment of a student of the facts, sincerely expressed, but the careless deliverance of an unfriendly critic, utterly misled by his sectarian prejudices. In the quotations made from Thomas Campbell by Dr. Richardson, to which Prof. W. has here referred us, he expresses very definitely his conception of faith in the following words:

"The full and firm persuasion, then, or hearty belief of the Divine testimony concerning Jesus, comprehensively considered as above defined, is that faith, in its proper and primary acceptation, to which the promises and privileges of salvation

are annexed. See Peter's confession and the recognitions of John in his first epistle. "Thou art the Christ the Son of the Living God." * * * 'Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God;' 'Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?'

We are content to stand by this definition of faith to-day, however men may choose to speak of it as Sandemanianism, or to scoff at it as heresy. It would have been perfectly satisfactory, as a definition, to Andrew Fuller, though it may not satisfy such modern Baptists as are more in sympathy with Methodists and "Salvationists" than with their own greatest denominational leader. The expression, "bare belief of the naked truth," which Prof. W. quotes, is put by Thomas Campbell into the mouth of an objector, and not given as his own conception of the subject. His statement of his own position, I have given above, in his own words. As to the question whether faith is voluntary, or involuntary, little need be said here. It is manifestly one or the other, according to the point of view from which the question is put; and that without regard to any particular theological system. A man can not believe at will, as everyone knows. And yet a man's beliefs are not independent of his will. A man, let us say, wants to know truth, wills to know it, and bends all his energies of mind and heart to the

task of finding it. This whole process is in the highest degree voluntary; but in the act of believing, in deciding what truth is, the final step is determined by the testimony, and may, therefore, be described as involuntary. To men like our professor, this may seem to make the whole matter of believing an intellectual process. Well, is the primary element of faith an act of the mind? Or is it a mere sentiment? An unexplained impulse of the emotions? Which? The scriptural use of the word *belief* stamps upon faith indelibly the nature of the intellect, rather than that of the sensibilities. Not but that, in the larger meaning of the term, as I have already explained, much more than this is included, but that the primary act of saving faith is the mind's acceptance of the testimony concerning Christ; and, consequently, Christ himself, as Savior and Lord. The New Testament writers do not employ words with the cast-iron fixedness of theologians, but with the flexibility and freedom characteristic of common men, in the full exercise of their common sense. So, while the primary element in faith is intellectual, in its larger meaning, and wider scope, it includes also the heart and the life. I may quote a few words here from a sermon preached in the Fourth Baptist Church, St. Louis, Mo., by Rev. L. S. Piker. The text was Hebrews XI. 6. I quote from the *Globe-Democrat* of Sept. 10th, 1888.

"Faith" he said, "is founded upon evidence.

The intelligent, thinking Christian has, for his faith in God, abiding internal and abounding external evidence. Faith has never been unobjectionally defined. Definition, according to the scholarly Broadus, teaches of what elements an idea, as a whole, is composed." * * * "To define faith is no easy matter, as it is too simple to admit of simplifying. "The *primary part* of faith, according to the text, is to believe that God is * * * Thus far, a person might believe and still not exercise saving faith. To believe that God *is*, meets a scriptural demand, but not the entire demand for salvation." I have quoted these words simply to show that when a Baptist preacher undertakes to expound faith, he is compelled to admit the intellectual ground of it, and to bear witness to the fact that it "is founded upon evidence." It is only when they want to inveigh against Sandemanianism, that Baptist preachers and Professors transfer faith quite away from the realm of the intellect to that of the emotions. The simple fact is that, at the *ground* of all emotional experiences and moral determinations embraced in faith, is the decision of the intellect. In its narrower and more elementary sense, it is the mind's "persuasion of the truth of what God hath said," while in the more comprehensive sense, it embraces trust in Christ, and that solemn commitment of the soul to him, which can only be superinduced by means of it.

The entire representation contained in the seventh and eighth chapters of Prof. Whitsitt's book invites sharp criticism. Even Baptist reviewers have not hesitated to express the opinion that there are insinuations here which are not warranted by a candid survey of the facts. *The eighth chapter bears the sub-title, "Mr. Campbell's Perversion to Sandemanianism," but it would have more exactly expressed its real character to have named it "Prof. Whitsitt's perversion of History to partisan purposes." He tells us truly (P. 67) that Thomas Campbell proposed to his followers (?) "as a basis for action," the following motto: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent." He is kind enough to admit that this was an excellent ideal. Indeed he says (P. 68) it was "a neat and popular expression of the fundamental principle of Mr. Greville Ewing." But strangely enough, he immediately adds that "it is nothing more than what is professed in fact, if not in form, by every sect of religious worshipers in Christendom." However, he is careful to say that, "in the mouth of Thomas Campbell, it probably signified nothing more important than 'When Mr. Ewing speaks, we speak; and when he is silent, we are silent.'" But whether "the father or the son should be awarded the credit of this taking expression of *the leading principle of Ewing*"—yet "only what

* See Appendix.

is professed by every sect of worshipers in Christendom"—he thinks, may not be easily determined. True, the son was in Scotland, when the father first employed it, but, then, it is naively suggested that he "may have had knowledge of the whole business," and may have mapped out, under Ewing's direction, perhaps—who knows?—the order in which each successive step should be taken in the far away regions of the new World! Of course, the object of this is to minimize the work of the elder Campbell, but more especially to suggest a possible connection of his movements here with the Sandemanian tenets of Greville Ewing on the other side of the sea. But even Alexander Campbell, it seems, was not destined to lead, uninterruptedly, the movement which he is supposed to have, in a sense, originated. Both the Campbells, Prof. Whitsitt is anxious to have us believe, were perfectly content with the "aspersion" they had received in infancy. The drift towards immersion in the little church at Brush Run was due to others; the Campbells were carried forward by a current which they were powerless to control. Let us see how it was done.

Mr. Campbell, in his reminiscenses, which I have freely quoted, speaks of his investigation of the baptismal question in such a way as to make the impression that it followed immediately his talk with Dr. Riddle concerning certain words in his father's Declaration and Address, and that he

continued it without intermission, until he reached the conviction, not only that infant baptism was unauthorized, but that the only admissible form of the ordinance was immersion. This, however, does not appear to have been quite the case. He seems indeed to have thrown aside, after having read them, the works in favor of infant baptism, which had been sent him, disgusted with their fallacious reasonings, and utterly dissatisfied with the Pedo-baptist position. But the final investigation, in which he decided the whole question in the light of the Greek Testament, took place at a somewhat later date. During this interval, his mind seems to have remained in a state of relative indecision. Nothing was more natural. The things pressing upon him chiefly were the emancipation of men's minds from the bondage of creeds, and the tyranny of church establishments not authorized in the word of God, and also the development of a true and trustworthy basis for Christian fellowship and co-operation in the Lord's work. Baptism was a mooted question, and the agitation of it seemed to promise strife rather than the unity which he had at heart. Naturally, he moved slowly in a matter so fraught with danger. Meantime, there was constant study of the Scriptures, and inevitably more or less discussion in the little community now embarked in a career of reformation. At the first communion service after the organization of the

church, it was noticed that three members—Joseph Bryant, Margaret Fullerton, and Abraham Altars—did not partake of the emblems. On inquiry, it appeared that they had none of them been baptized; as Dr. Richardson expresses it, "none of them had received baptism at all in any of its so-called forms." (Memoirs, page 372). After interviews, resulting in a common understanding, Thomas Campbell immersed them. But, of course, the question once fairly before the little church, discussion was not to be avoided. Nor was it desirable that it should be. Dr. Richardson casually mentions that these discussions, continued to be kept up during the absence of Alexander Campbell on a preaching tour of some weeks. Prof. Whitsitt lays hold of these circumstances to concoct a tale which no one is likely to believe, and of which he himself should be thoroughly ashamed. He represents Joseph Bryant and James Foster as having been very active in urging the immersionist view. Joseph Bryant especially, needed to be concilliated. He was a very important personage. Indeed, Prof. Whitsitt conjectures that he "was already recognized as an elegible match for Miss Dorothea Campbell, to whom he was united in marriage about twenty months later." Under such circumstances it was not easy to resist him. It began to look as if the church at Brush Run was "going to pieces."

"Alexander now perceived that speedy action must be had, else their cause was lost."

"If Bryant and the majority of the little community at Brush Run"—so Prof. Whitsitt gravely writes—"could have been induced to tolerate aspersion, it is probable that the Campbells would never have found it convenient to leave the side of the sprinkling Sandemanians." Page 79.

And this—shall we believe it?—is what passes with some Baptists for history! A more unwarranted imputation of unworthy motives, it is safe to say, has never been uttered. Suppose that the discussion which occurred under the circumstances here mentioned did have something to do with the thorough investigation of the subject by Alexander Campbell which unmistakably followed, what of that? As to the agitation in the church, and the signs of a general disintegration here intimated, nothing apparently could be farther from the fact. Concerning the state of the church at this very time, Dr. Richardson writes as follows: "These religious meetings were sources of great enjoyment. Warmly attached to one another for the truth's sake, and sympathizing with each other in their trials and religious experiences, they semed to be of one heart and of one soul. The Bible was their daily study, and they came to the assembly, like bees to a hive, laden with the sweet lessons of instruction it afforded, and ready

to say in the language of the Psalm they had sung at their organization:

> 'God is the Lord, who, unto us
> Hath made light to arise.'"

But Prof. Whitsitt, full of his own absurd fantasies, passes all this unnoticed. His role is that of the small pettifogger, and, it must be confessed, he has played it not unskillfully. A man may be forgiven much, who writes or speaks in the heat of theological debate, but Prof. Whitsitt has no such excuse. He has written deliberately, "with malice," it may be said, "and aforethought." To seriously ask us to receive, as history, the things which he has here written, must be regarded as the climax of effrontery. Mr. Campbell's long and faithful Christian life places his memory beyond the reach of such petty, partisan attempts to darken it with dishonor. And yet, it is to be regretted that the rancor and bigotry, which assailed him with all sorts of detraction during his life, could not, now that he has gone, reverently leave his character to the final decision of Him who is the Judge both of the living and the dead. In this work of detraction, Prof. Whitsitt is ingenious, after a sort, but he is far from ingenuous. The facts given by Dr. Richardson are explained out of his own perverse fancy in such way as to give plausible coloring to a picture which is too unlike the reality to be even a good caricature. It is needless to follow him, item by item, in this

part of his work. It would be ungrateful toil, and, happily, there is not the least reason for its performance. As a single example, however, of this character of work, the following is offered.

On page 74, it is said: "Alexander rejected for awhile the conceit of Ewing and the Sandemanians, that faith is nothing other than mere belief, *which is produced by testimony alone, without reference to the regenerating grace of God.*" And further down on the same page, we find this: "The 7th of April 1811, is the latest date on which, according to his biographer, he was willing to affirm that faith is of the operation of God, and an effect of almighty power and *regenerating grace.*"

Now the untheological reader will utterly fail to appreciate, or even to perceive, the exquisite touch of our historian's art, as here exhibited. *His* conclusion will be prompt, and free from any misgiving, that, according to Dr. Richardson, Mr. Campbell's chosen biographer, the latter denied, from the date here mentioned, all divine agency in the production of faith, and rejected outright the grace of God in regeneration. But such a conclusion is far from the truth. Mr. Campbell always believed that regeneration, or change of heart, is of the grace of God, *through faith.* But the thing which Mr. C. never believed after the afore-mentioned date, is the unscriptural and irrational assumption that "*faith is the effect of almighty*

power and regenerating grace." Notice the two predicates: (1) faith is the effect of omnipotent power, (2) it is the effect of regeneration, or follows regeneration. Of course, Alexander Campbell, through his long life, rejected both these unreasonable and unbiblical assumptions. But Dr. Richardson, in the very connection referred to by Mr. W., is careful to say that he always "*retained the idea of a divine interposition, but came to regard it as a providential agency, rather than as a direct operation of the Spirit, as held by popular parties.*" Thus the velvet touch of the accomplished caricaturist is exposed to vulgar eyes! Pity that manly and candid Baptists, who love truth and adore the Savior, should be in danger of "perversion" from one who seems to imagine he is doing God service by offering insult to the living, and defaming the memory of the dead.

But, touching the relation of testimony to faith as here referred to, and as held by Mr. Campbell, a few words may not be out of place. It is true that Mr. Campbell always maintained the necessity of testimony in order to faith. He saw clearly, or at least thought he saw clearly, that, between the divine testimony concerning Jesus, and the faith in him, which saves the soul, there is a certain fixed and definite connection, grounded, evermore, in the very nature of the soul itself. To give the passages in the New Testament in which this connection is positively taught, or fairly indi-

cated, would be to transcribe no small portion of the book. This conception, which is biblically true, by a hundred unmistakable passages, is beyond all doubt a demand of reason as well. The faith which saves, if Paul may be believed, "Comes by hearing the word of God." If John understood himself at all, it is the product of the divine testimony. Listen to his words: "It is the Spirit that bears witness, because the Spirit is the truth. For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and the three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater; for the witness of God is this, that he hath borne witness concerning his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in him; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he hath not believed in the witness God hath borne concerning his Son." (1 Jno. 5: 7-11, R. V.)

Does Prof. Whitsitt imagine that the recognition of the necessary relation between testimony and faith is a denial of God's providence, or the Spirit's agency? He writes, indeed, as if he were disturbed by some such fantasy. But it is not to be thought this disturbance is real. He knows better. He only seeks to mislead, concerning Mr. Campbell and the Disciples, those who do not know better; namely, a great many Baptists, and, perhaps, some who are not Baptists, but who are only too willing to believe an evil report against

those who are not in ecclesiastical affiliation with themselves. Will Prof. Whitsitt undertake to say that any one has ever believed in Christ without having heard the gospel? Will he assert that, where the gospel is preached, faith is "of the almighty power, and regenerating grace of God," independent of divine testimony, through the word? He will assert no such thing. It is too late in the day for college professors to stultify themselves by affirming such an absurdity. If there is one thing more than another which this age demands of its religious teachers, it is that no insult shall be offered to the most certain judgments of a trained and reverent intellect. It was otherwise when Alexander Campbell began his great work, but it shall not be otherwise any more until the Lord comes to judge the world. The spirit of mysticism and fetichism is well nigh exorcised now, in Christian lands, from all human souls. And it is well that such is the case. It has had sway quite long enough. Intelligent Christians will maintain the fact of divine agency, and the necessity of divine truth and testimony, in order to faith and regeneration, henceforth to the end of the world.

Prof. Whitsitt is unwilling to give the least credit of originality to the Campbells. They always copied from some one else. They were only slavish followers of Greville Ewing, at one time, and of Archibald M'Lean at another. In the

matter of "baptism for remission of sins" the impression is at first sought to be made that it was derived from M'Lean. But nothing can be more absurd. M'Lean positively taught, as was heretofore stated, that justification follows immediately the act of believing so as to antedate not only all obedience to ordinances, but even the holy disposition of the soul itself, which he regarded as the first effect of faith. Otherwise, says M'Lean, it could not be said: "He justifieth the ungodly." But M'Lean has "so guarded his utterances," says Prof. Whitsitt, "that it might be in the power of an opponent to affirm that he was not a thorough-paced advocate of the theory of baptismal remission." (P. 93). No doubt, M'Lean guarded very carefully his utterances, to the end that no one should have grounds to misrepresent him. But, alas! what watchfulness can thoroughly anticipate and shut off the malign distortions of theological partisans! Men like our Professor defy the most conscientious attempts to guard against the perversion of their utterances. But while M'Lean guarded his utterances carefully, if we may credit Prof. Whitsitt, it was not so with a certain "Scotch Baptist Church" in the city of New York. This church sent out, it seems, a sort of circular letter, which is supposed to have been "forwarded to all the Sandemanian churches of the immersion observance in America." This letter, it is contended, boldy avowed "the same

view regarding the design of baptism to which the Campbells later gave their adhesion." "The same texts, which the sect of Disciples (or Campbellites) are in the habit of setting forward, are produced in this pamphlet, and handled in much the same way, in order to support the conclusion that baptism was designed for the remission of sins."

This is only a half truth; indeed, it is scarcely that. The texts of Scripture, which speak of "the uses and purposes for which baptism was appointed," are indeed carefully given, and their importance is duly insisted upon; but the conclusion that "baptism is for remission of sins" is conspicuous only by its entire absence. If Bro. Baxter, in his life of Scott, has intimated the contrary, then he was mistaken. *There is no baptism for remission of sins in this New York letter.* What was Professor Whitsitt thinking about, when he read—or did he read?—the following paragraph in said letter?

"No one who has been in the habit of considering it (baptism) merely as an ordinance (or rite, G. W. L.) can read these passages with attention without being surprised at the wonderful powers, and qualities, and effects, and uses, which are there apparently"—please notice this word—'ascribed to it.' "If the language employed respecting it, in many of the passages were "to be taken literally"—please note this—it would import that

remission of sins is to be obtained by baptism, that escape from the wrath to come is effected in baptism, that men are born children of God by baptism, etc., etc." "All these things, *if all the passages before us were construed literally* would be ascribed to baptism. And it was a literal construction of these passages which led professed Christians in the early ages to believe that baptism was necessary to salvation. Hence arose infant baptism, and other customs equally unauthorized. And, from a like literal construction of the words of the Lord Jesus, at the last supper, arose the awful notion of transubstantiation."

Now the careful reader has not failed to see (1), that certain things are here said to be taught concerning baptism, *provided*, that the words of the texts referred to are to be construed literally: but, (2), that the literal construction is clearly repudiated as untenable. How the authors did construe these passages, will appear from their own words, as follows:

"It is for the churches of God, therefore, to consider well, whether it does not clearly and forcibly appear from what is said of baptism in the passages before us, taken each in its proper connection, that baptism was appointed as an institution *strikingly significant* of several of the most important things relating to the kingdom of God; whether it was not in baptism that men professed by deed, as they had already done by word, to

have the remission of sins through the death of Jesus Christ, and to have a firm persuasion of being raised from the dead through him and after his example; whether it was not in baptism that they *put off* the ungodly character and its lusts, and put on the new life of righteousness; whether it was not in baptism that they *professed to have their sins washed away, through the blood* of the Lord and Savior, etc."

I need not quote more fully. It is absolutely clear that the church which sent forth this letter entertained precisely the same view of the design of baptism which is held by the Associated Baptists throughout this country, at the present time. Baptism, on the part of the recipient, was a profession in act, of having received already the remission of sins; as respects the divine purpose in requiring it, it was intended to set forth symbolically the cleansing of the soul from sin through the blood of Christ. This, and only this, was in it. If they dwelt with more emphasis upon its importance than Baptists are now expected to do, the fact may be explained by considering that they were not under the same necessity of guarding their words to keep off suspicion of sympathy with the heresies of the Disciples and New Testament Christians. This whole matter is conspicuously plain and simple.

Concerning Prof. Whitsitt's insistent efforts to depreciate and belittle the Campbells as men of

intellectual power, nothing more than a word of reference is here necessary. Thomas Campbell, he tell us, was only a "convenient echo;" and if ever Alexander "had an original idea, he took pains to avoid giving expression to it in such of his writings as have been submitted to the inspection of the public."

No doubt our Professor needed to let off the gall which was in him, and if such words as these answered that purpose, we need make no complaint. If, in face of the intelligence of the age, he can choose to express himself in this fashion, it is his affair, not ours. No friend of the Campbells need care to say one word in reply.

It might be well to have a thoughtful comparison of the views of the Disciples and Baptists. Perhaps, some day, we shall have it. But Prof. Whitsitt's book adds nothing valuable to the literature of this long, and too often bitter, controversy.

CHAPTER VII.

THE BAPTISTS.

Against the Baptist people, as such, I have no hard words to utter; I recall no personal grievances, leaving bitter memories, which might justify, even on the world's principle of retaliation, any harsh or unkind criticism. I owe them nothing but love. There is not a man of them all, who follows sincerely and reverently the Lord Jesus, albeit, like the rest of us, oftentimes, at a distance, and with unsteady step, that I do not unfeignedly love for Jesus' sake.

There is not a single such follower of Christ among them that I do not habitually recognize and treat as a brother in the common faith. He may cling to much "foolishness" in theology, or dwell with fond delight on certain pietistic superstitions connected with his "experience" of God's grace in his soul—a thing he is quite sure to do—and it makes no difference at all. If he bear the "image and superscription" of the Lord Jesus, God has received him, with all his imperfections of knowledge and life, and who am I, that I should reject one of these "little ones" for whom Christ died? Upon this principle the Disciples have always acted. A letter from a Baptist church has always been a sufficient passport to our fellow-

ship. It has mattered nothing at all that there has been no reciprocity in our relations with them. We have remained true to our divine law of affiliation throughout all the keen controversies and unfraternal imputations of evil heresies, in the seventy-five years (speaking in round numbers) which have passed away since our movement first began to assume definite shape. To this principle we shall be true hereafter, as we have been heretofore, whatever the coming years may have in store for us.

But why should our Baptist brethren—any of them—put on airs in talking about us? Why write articles in their papers, or books even, whose chief characteristic is the partisan's bitter sneer? Are we not every whit their equals in whatever gives prestige and power to a body of Christian believers? Nay, taking into account our briefer history as a distinct people, are we not rapidly gaining upon them in all the elements of "denominational" greatness? If I may speak foolishly, "in this confidence of boasting," as it were, I would say that it concerns us not at all—save for the honor of our common Christianity—what the narrow-minded zealots of any sect in Christendom may choose to say about us. The time has gone by when the *odium theologicum* could be used successfully as a weapon against us. Save for the honor of the Lord's cause, so often put to shame by his professed friends, there is no reason why

we should give ourselves a moment's anxiety over any of these things. But for this, we could listen patiently to Prof. Whitsitt, and all the rest, as long as they find comfort in pouring out the bitterness that is in them. For the harm it does us we are not greatly concerned.

But who are these Baptist people, from whose ranks some one arises ever and anon, "speaking great swelling words of vanity?" What is *their* "origin?" What their history? Was John the Baptizer their founder? Have they had a continuous existence through all the centuries since? There are indeed some partisans among them who would fain have men think so. Their real scholars do not pretend to any such thing. They know better, and are candid enough to tell what they know.

But, really, now, how shall we define a Baptist? How shall we differentiate him? In point of fact he is a vague specimen. There are General Baptists, Particular Baptists, and "Scottish Baptists," in the mother country; there are Missionary Baptists and Anti-missionary Baptists; Baptists that are Calvinists, and Baptists that believe in the freedom of the human WILL; to say nothing of Seventh Day Baptists, of Six Principle Baptists, and of German Baptists, or Tunkers, all here in our own America. The reader sees the difficulty. To which of these half dozen sects, all claiming to be "Baptists" par excellence, shall we accord the

honor of calling it the Baptist Church? And what are the relations of these Baptist sects to each other? Do they mutually give and receive letters of commendation? Do they break bread with each other in the Lord's Supper? Not to any great extent, certainly. But our special anxiety is to find the Baptist Church. Can Prof. Whitsitt locate it? Will he he give us its metes and bounds, so that we can speak advisedly in regard to it? He will scarcely undertake so hopeless a task. Or, if he should see that no aggregation of Baptist local communities can be called a CHURCH, in the New Testament sense of the term, and so prefer to speak of *Baptist churches*, and of the "Baptist denomination," would he be so kind as to indicate clearly the latter's exact comprehension? How many of these sects, popularly called Baptists, are outside of the Baptist denomination, as Prof. Whitsitt would employ that expression? If a member of Spurgeon's Baptist church of the free communion "observance," for instance, should offer a letter to a Baptist church of the close communion "observance," here in America, would it be received at par value in such church? Or, if a Free Will Baptist should bring a letter from his church in New England to the Baptist church in Louisville, in which Prof. Whitsitt has his membership, how would he be received? Would his letter be received as coming from "a sister church of the same faith and order?" Do "Primitive"

Baptists and Missionary Baptists mutually recognize each other's baptism and sound Baptistic order and orthodoxy? Do they give letters to, and receive letters from, each other, as of the same faith and order? Of course, an outsider can not know all about the "usage" in such cases, but he need not wholly repress his curiosity. It is laudable to desire information upon doubtful points, when circumstances give importance to them. Now of course the "Scottish Baptists" are not Baptists at all, but only "Sandemanians of the immersion observance." And of course we are to suppose that Prof. Whitsitt would not think of receiving into fellowship a Scotch Baptist without a formal renunciation of his Sandemanianism. He might, perhaps, go behind his letter, and examine him on his "experience." But that would amount to nothing. A genuine Scotch Baptist can tell quite as good a Baptistic experience as Prof. Whitsitt himself; and this our learned professor very well knows. He is as sound on depravity, on divine sovereignty, on the influence of the Spirit, on personal election, as the soundest professor in any Baptist Seminary in America. He can not be shut out by any of these tests. Call him "a Sandemanian of the immersion observance," and refuse him fellowship on that ground. You must do that, or receive him.

But what then? If you receive him you recognize his Sandemanian heresy, or at least account

it no bar to fellowship (which is indeed the only sensible thing to be done in such a case), and if you do not receive him, you violate what is said to be a fundamental usage of the Baptist people, which has obtained among them, with more or less uniformity, from time immemorial, namely, not to make speculative differences—such differences as affect not "a true experience of God's grace in the soul"—a bar to fellowship. Is a man less a Baptist because he is a Calvinist or an anti-Calvinist? Is he less or more a Baptist because he doubts the divine origin, or sound expediency of Missionary Societies? Baptists were not wont in the old days to regard these questions as presenting an insurmountable bar to fellowship. At the time of the division between missionary, and anti-missionary Baptists here in the great West, the position of the missionary party gave them an advantage which served them a most excellent purpose while the work of separation was going on. They said, "Let us have no quarrel over this matter. Let our churches be free to follow their convictions. Let the individual members in every church have the same freedom." This was sound and scriptural. It was common prudence as well. Nay, it was more; it was the shrewdest sort of strategy. That the missionary leaven would finally leaven pretty much the whole Baptist lump, was clear to the far-seeing leaders, provided it could only have time to diffuse itself.

If the churches could be held together, while the leavening process was going on, the end was sure. But clearly, in the event of separation, the burden of responsibility would rest with the separatists. The wisdom of these missionary leaders is apparent to every one now. Call it conscience or strategy, the effect was the same. Multitudes remained in the churches, and finally became good missionary Baptists, who would have gone out so fast that you could not have counted them, if the issue had been too hotly pressed. Indeed, in not a few cases, the majority would have been on the anti-missionary side. But the point in all this, which concerns the present argument, is the manifest difficulty of ascertaining the conditions which determine a true Baptistic status, in relation both to individuals and churches. Perhaps Professor Whitsitt was not thinking about this difficulty, when he so unceremoniously thrust the whole Scottish Baptist fraternity outside the pale of genuine Baptistism. They do not even belong, in his classification, to what some Baptists are wont, on occasion, to call "the Baptist family." They are only "Sandemanians of the immersion observance." For shame, Prof. Whitsitt! Are not Scotch Baptists as good Christians as Prof. Whitsitt himself? And have they not as much right, if they choose to do so, to call themselves Baptists? There can be no doubt of it, at all. Now the truth we are seeking seems to be this: While

Baptists have not been outspoken in denying to speculative differences of the sort we have here referred to the importance which belongs only to questions of fellowship, there has been, nevertheless, to a certain extent, a sort of tacit recognition among them of that great principle. They might, indeed, separate into sects over such differences, but they still remained BAPTISTIC SECTS. They belonged in common to the great "Baptist family," and when the Baptist Israel was to be numbered, they were entitled to be counted. So, likewise, when Baptist histories were to be written, their claim to a true Baptistic character was duly recognized. Thus, there are different "orders" of Baptists, but—shall we put it in that way?—only one true Baptistic test; namely, the faith in Christ, and that one faith expressed in immersion, as the one divine form of baptism. Is it this faith, expressed in the one baptism, which is to be regarded as the true and only test of Baptistic status? If so, the "Baptist family" is indeed a large family, or rather a tribe, including several families, as the one Israel of old included the twelve tribes. But is it indeed true that faith in Christ expressed in Christian baptism (immersion), constitutes the one condition of church and Christian fellowship among Baptists? We should hesitate to accept this statement, and yet it is supported by very high Baptist authority. I give for the reader's consideration the following para-

graph from the introduction to Orchard's History of the Baptists (Tenth Edition, Nashville, Tenn., 1855).

"The ground of unity and denominational claim to the people whose Christian characters are detailed, is not the harmony of their creeds or views; this was not *visible or essential in the first age;* but THE BOND OF UNION, *among our denomination in all ages, has been* FAITH IN CHRIST; *and that faith* PUBLICLY EXPRESSED *by a voluntary submission to his authority and doctrine in baptism.*" Introduction, p. 14.

I give this extract with capitals and italics, just as I find it in the book. The words are those of Mr. Orchard, quoted in an introductory essay, signed with the initials J. R. G., i. e., J. R. Graves, then of Nashville, Tenn. Of course Mr. Graves is presumed to have given his endorsement to the extract by quoting it without objection. But surely he must have hesitated to do this. The canon here laid down is one that reaches very far indeed, and a Baptist of Mr. Graves' school could hardly accept it, *ex animo*, as a statement of fact, if he had, at the time, a clear understanding of the question. But Mr. Orchard doubtless meant what he said. He saw clearly that any plausible attempt to make out a Baptistic succession would depend upon the adoption of a very liberal test of Baptist character; and in the freer and larger spirit of the English Baptists, was satisfied with

the rule, as he here gives it. Can we hope to get our American Baptists to see and acknowledge what Mr. Orchard's rule really means, and then to cordially accept it as a sound test of Baptist orthodoxy? If so, it is certain that a great point will have been gained.

But, in point of fact, we should say it is not true that the bond of union among Baptists has always, or ever, been what Mr. Orchard represents it to have been. In his desire to make out some sort of Baptistic succession from the days of the apostles, he gives up the Baptist bond of union, as utterly untenable for his purpose, and adopts, outright, that of the Disciples of Christ. "The bond of union among our denomination," he says, "has always been *faith in Christ, and that faith* PUBLICLY EXPRESSED *by a voluntary submission to his authority and doctrine in baptism.*" It is simply impossible to express in words more definitely the view of this subject maintained by the Disciples from the very beginning, only, with us, this bond of union is held to be the test of fellowship for all Christian churches, instead of a denominational, or party test. Mr. Orchard's canon of ecclesiastical fellowship is catholic or Christian, and in no true sense Baptistic. But, as was said a moment since, there seems to have been a sort of under-current of conviction that some such rule was demanded by the claim Baptists were constantly setting up to some sort of

denominational continuity in history. On any other principle than the broad one here laid down, it was clear that no shadow even of plausibility could be imparted to such a claim. Hence, for the purpose of tracing Baptistic succession, a law of affiliation is laid down as denominational, while, as a matter of fact, the practice among Baptists has always been very different. Are all the sects of Baptists which do positively maintain a separate existence to be counted together as *the Baptist denomination*, as Orchard's rule implies? If so, why not go a step further, and abolish altogether the principle of sect-fellowship on agreement in doctrinal beliefs, and merge all these distinct factions into one single Baptist fraternity, upon the larger and more catholic basis here laid down? It is certain that these Baptist sects are kept apart by their "doctrinal differences," which constitute, therefore, the real bonds of union in Baptist practice, while Mr. Orchard's bond of union is a purely theoretical one, devised for the purpose of giving a sort of logical basis to the plea of Baptistic succession. So the question returns, Who are the Baptists? By what rule shall we know them? Is the larger faction to be taken as the denomination, and the rest to be regarded as heretical, or, at least, disorderly "offshoots" from the true stock? How is this? And upon the offshoot theory, may it not appear that the "Regulars," who are anti-missionary, are the true

Baptists, and that our missionary brethren are only offshoots? I care not to press these questions further. I am sure we shall not be able to decide them. And I am equally sure that Orchard's bond of union, which is that of the Disciples, and not Baptistic at all, will continue to be repudiated in practice by all these Baptist sects, for many years to come. But, in any event, it behooves such Baptists as Prof. Whitsitt to say whom he acknowledges as Baptists, and whom he repudiates as heretics, or disorderly "offshoots." And, especially, it behooves him to show why the regular, or Primitive Baptists, should not be regarded as in the true line of succession from the Baptist fathers, and himself and brethren as "offshoots" from the one original Baptistic stem. There was a time, it is safe to say, when three-fourths of the Baptists in America were decidedly opposed to missionary societies, and possibly, to all that is now regarded as distinctively missionary work. This must not be forgotten.

But, if the question of origin and history is to be brought to the front, then the Baptist scribes will have their hands full without stopping to utter naughty gibes at any of their neighbors. Prof. Whitsitt expresses the opinion that the Disciples have never succeeded as Biblical exegetes. What truth there is in this opinion we need not stop here to determine. But how many Baptists are known as exegetes of distinction in the great

world of Christian scholarship to-day? It will be time enough to taunt us with deficiency in this respect, when we shall have had the length of time they have had, and shall show no better results. Old-fashioned Baptist text-preaching is hardly to be taken as a phase of exegetics, but certainly it furnishes a sort of test of Baptist aptitude for exegetical work, in days long past. The writer of this review has heard some strange sermons from Baptist pulpits in his time. One preacher took as a text this verse of Solomon's Song: "*My beloved is gone down in his garden, to the beds of spices to feed in the gardens, and to gather lilies*," 6: 2. There was little of exegesis in this case, but the preacher found a stirring, and, for those days, a thoroughly characteristic Baptist sermon in his text. There are Baptist communities to-day, which would be transported into ecstasies by such a sermon. Another took this text: "And they called Rebecca, and said unto her, Wilt thou go with this man? And she answered and said, I will go." Gen. 24: 58. Into this simple text—which was a favorite one with Baptists in those days—the preacher read his whole theory of redemption. Abraham's servant was the preacher of the gospel; Rebecca was the sinner; the camel on which Rebecca rode was the law; when Rebecca veiled herself, and dismounted, at the end of the journey, the preacher saw a most impressive type of a sinner's surrender to Christ, after

the law has done its work in his heart! Oh, no! It was not exegesis, certainly; but it was genuine Baptist preaching, of the most popular type, at the time when Alexander Campbell preached his sermon on the law before the Redstone Association. And the fact that the sermon dealt a death-blow to such preaching was doubtless the reason why the Redstone leaders saw heresy in it! The Baptist scribe who knows Baptist history, will be a little chary of reproaches which may provoke even the most good-natured retort along these lines. There never has been a time in the history of the Disciples when their ministry would not compare favorably, in every respect, with that of any Baptist party. This is not boasting, but a simple fact of history; which, however, would not have been mentioned, if the case had not seemed to require it.

But the "origin" of the Baptists! What special cause of gratulation can Baptists find in it? Of course our American Baptists are sprung, for the most part, from English sources. What, then, was the origin of the English Baptists? In a brilliant article on Baptist Theology, printed first in the *Contemporary Review*, and afterwards copied into the *Library Magazine* for June, 1888. Dr. Clifford of England informs us that the first church of General Baptists in England was founded in, or about, 1611, by John Smyth and Thomas Helwyss. "Besides the idea of the spir-

itual life, they also preached the doctrine of general redemption." "Twenty years afterward," continues Dr. Clifford, "and on the 12th of September, 1633, another Baptist Church of a different type was created at Wopping by secession from the Independent Church, dating back to 1616. Its pastor was John Spillsbury, and its theology was fashioned on the model of that marvelous piece of doctrinal literature, the *Institutes* of John Calvin." From these beginnings have sprung, directly, or indirectly, all the Baptists of Great Britain and the United States. But did John Smyth baptize himself? I can not tell. His Pedobaptist opponents said that he did, but that may have been prejudice and persecution. The Lord knows what the truth is. Perhaps the world will never know. And the Particular Baptist church of which Spillsbury was pastor—whence did that derive the scriptural baptism? The question can not be certainly answered. Benedict (History of the Baptists, P. 337) admits that much obscurity hangs over the whole matter. He says: "It must be admitted that there is some obscurity respecting the manner in which the ancient immersion of adults, which appears to have been discontinued, was restored, when, after the long night of anti-Christian apostasy, persons were at first baptized on a profession of faith." This remark is made in connection with the Particular Baptists. But concerning the Smyth-Helwyss

foundation of General Baptists, he confesses the same uncertainty. Smyth, after embracing Baptist sentiments, had fled to Holland to escape persecution. Now, there were Baptist churches in Holland, but they were as "fantastic" a set of people as any seeker after queer social and religious phenomena could wish to see. "The foreign anabaptists," says Crosby, "were such as denied Christ's having taken the flesh of the Virgin Mary, the lawfulness of magistracy, and such like, which Mr. Smyth and his followers looked on as great errors; so that they could not be thought by him proper administrators of baptism."

Upon the whole, Benedict thinks that Smyth and his followers "first formed themselves into a church, and then appointed two of their number (perhaps Mr. Smyth and Mr. Helwyss) to baptize the rest." He adds, with evident feeling, that "this subject caused considerable uneasiness and reproach to the first Baptists after the Reformatoin, both general and particular." The rise of the whole Baptist denomination in England and America, in this irregular way, seems to be pretty well assured, and if "origin" is the question, then they are the last people in this country who ought to begin throwing stones at others. Of course, the case of Roger Williams and his Rhode Island Baptist church is well known. The Baptists ought not to press questions of "origin" too zealously, if they do not wish to hear these things re-

ferred to as a part of their ecclesiastical inheritance.

But the Scottish Baptists, so zealously traduced by Mr. Whitsitt, were a theologically respectable people, on any showing, compared with the English Baptists before Fuller's day. Listen to this Baptist witness: "The prevailing system of doctrine among the Baptist churches at this period was ultra Calvinism—a system which denies true faith to be the duty of every one to whom the gospel comes; which consequently must paralyze the efforts of ministers 'to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature'; commanding all men everywhere to repent, at the peril of their souls." Fuller's first, if not his greatest work, was to demolish this prevalent and mischievous anti-nomianism, as Dr. Clifford styles it. Here Fuller and the Scotch Baptists were one, though they reached the same goal by different routes. If one takes the history of the numerous Baptist sects, and traces them carefully through all changes and metamorphoses, he will find no great reason for the indulgence of that spirit of self-sufficiency and exclusivism, which so markedly characterizes certain Baptist leaders of our time. To barely hint at these things, is all that is possible in this review. One may well hesitate to disagree with Dr. Jno. Duncan, who says, as quoted by Dr. Clifford: "There is only one real heresy. Antinomianism." The reproach of this heresy,

both in England and America, the Baptists must be content to bear, beyond any other people. If they are now happily freed from its blighting influence, they are to be sincerely congratulated by all good men. It is only admissible to remind them of these things in order to keep them humble, and prevent them from putting on airs which make them ridiculous. If they will behave themselves hereafter, we do not care to reproach them with the past. May the dear Lord lead them into all truth, in his own time, and in his own way!

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RELATION OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST TO ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AND OTHER LEADERS.

The Disciples cheerfully acknowledge a debt of gratitude to the Campbells, and other able and excellent men, who led in the work of reformation in the earlier years of this century. Nor do they deny their indebtedness to all the reformers, Baptists and Pedobaptists, of whatever schools of thought. Scarcely a great man has lived, and wrought for God, whose labors have not shed light on some of the questions which interest all thoughtful men. The true disciple is thankful for such help, let it come from what source it may. All the men who have sought and found truth we reckon among our spiritual ancestors, although we may reject many of their formulas. The progress from the great apostasy has been slow and toilsome. Those who, from time to time, have attained, under God, to the largest measures of divine reality, have been our greatest benefactors, and constitute the true succession of reformers, from Wyckliffe down to our own day. We agree heartily with Dr. Clifford, when he states the progress of reformation as follows:

"The all-absorbing question of the 16th century

was this—what is the church of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of what persons ought it to consist? Protestantism was the bold rejection of the established and orthodox answer supplied by Romanism to this inquiry; Puritanism qualified and cleansed the answer of Protestantism; Separatism went further, and gave increased sharpness to the answer urged by the Puritans; the Brownists, or Independents, still on the forward march, eliminated the parochial element from church membership, and insisted on the possession of spiritual life. Then came the Baptists and added the obligation of developing the spiritual life into *avowed consciousness* before admission into the church. And inasmuch as the only mode of conscientious speech known in those days was that of separation from those with whom they differed, *away they went, carrying whatever theology they had inherited to their new ecclesiastical home.*"

To complete this statement, and bring down the succession to the present day, it remains to be said, that the Disciples have added to whatever of truth the above named parties had found, the *scriptural basis of fellowship and ecclesiastical unity*, and also given an answer to the question of *personal salvation* surpassing in clearness and fullness, both of biblical proof and rational exposition, anything known in history since the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ went home to glory.

And for myself, I may be permitted to say, that

of this final advance, I think, there is no reasonable doubt, and that the step thus taken by the Disciples is the longest and best single step since Luther, in the whole series of reformation movements. The true law of ecclesiastic affiliation—namely, the faith in Christ and obedience to his commandments—and the great question of personal salvation—"what shall I do to be saved?"—cleared of all irrelevant and unscriptural issues, and alike of all mystic and superstitious fantasies—this is the claim of the Disciples before the world of our day, a claim for which, if just, we can afford to toil, and, if need be, to suffer, till the Lord shall come. We seek not to disparage the work of others, but with our own mission we are quite content. If the Lord shall enable us to be faithful to it, in our day and generation, what more need we desire? Let us be satisfied and thankful.

But what is our true relation to the great and good men to whom we so cheerfully acknowledge our special indebtedness? This is a question of no mean significance in estimating the value of our distinctive plea. It is a question, too, the right answer to which it seems very hard to make clear to our brethren in the various denominational folds. They will pardon us, I trust, for holding very emphatically that the fault is not on our side, or in the cause we plead. When Luther completed his work, he had not only succeeded in

impressing his personal modes of thought and experience upon his contemporaries, who followed immediately in his movement, but he had taken care that these modes of thought, this mould of religious experience, should be perpetuated indefinitely, if possible, to the very end of time. He had bravely rejected the Papal traditions, but he seemed not at all averse to imposing upon his successors, in all the time to come, his own traditions. Grant that he thought his theological ideas identical, for substance, with the original gospel, and that does not at all change the fact. He left an ecclesiastical organism pledged to the maintenance of these theological ideas, and fully equipped for the perpetuation of its own existence without limit as to duration. Nothing short of an ecclesiastical revolution, similar to that which he had led against Rome, could ever make the church which he may be said to have founded, anything more or better than "The Lutheran Church." Its symbolism was Lutheran throughout, and Luther's articles were bound upon the consciences of his followers, if not *in secula seculorum*, at least to the end of this present world. Luther, it is clear, intended to found a church to perpetuate his own ideas. Doubtless he believed these ideas to be, only in another shape, the gospel of Jesus Christ, but, as was said a moment ago, that does not alter the fact. Luther's church was intended to reflect forever Luther's conception of the Christian relig-

ion. The Lutheran articles are bound upon its conscience to-day.

Now what is here said of Luther is manifestly just as true of Calvin and Wesley. Calvinian articles constitute the doctrinal basis, the ecclesiastical organic law and bond of union, of every Calvinistic church on earth—Presbyterian, Puritan and Baptist, alike. As for Wesley, there is no power in the church he founded to make the slightest change in the "articles of religion" which he fastened irrevocably upon it. Changes of an "economical" character may be made by a general conference, but it has no right to—it dare not—touch a single article of the Wesleyan faith. These facts speak volumes on the question for the moment before us. Let no reader stop till he sees clearly their whole meauing; otherwise, the differentiation we are seeking to effect will not clearly appear. But concerning Baptists and other congregational communities, it is proper to say that there has ever been a measure of relaxation from the bondage of confessional authority, and yet not that genuine freedom in Christ which suffices to take them out of the general category to which I have here assigned them. In the briefer and less rigid epitomes of doctrine adopted by Baptist churches and associations, the distinctive ideas and traditions of the Baptist fathers of different schools are still more or less faithfully perpetuated.

As respects the Disciples, however, the case is very different. The first thing in our movement was to secure freedom, for all time, from the tyranny of mere confessional authority. The first number of *The Christian Baptist* bore at the front the flag of Christian freedom. At the head of its first page was inscribed this motto:

"*Style no man on earth your Father; for he alone is your Father who is in heaven; and all ye are brethren. Assume not the title of Rabbi; for you have only one Teacher; neither assume the title of Leader; for you have only one Leader, the Messiah.*"

This motto sounded the key-note of our reformation. In the mouth of Mr. Campbell these words were not the expression of an aggressive and defiant individualism. Mr. C. was indeed, from the beginning of his public career, an independent thinker and a fearless proclaimer of his assured convictions. But no man felt more profoundly than he the need of mutual toleration and respect, in order to the maintenance of spiritual unity, and a catholic fellowship in the congregations of the living God. What he asserted for himself he accorded freely and unhesitatingly to the humblest disciple in the ranks. The chosen motto was not for himself only, but for all. "Where the Bible speaks he would speak, where the Bible was silent he would be silent," as to authoritative utterance. Nothing should be made a test of fel-

lowship or membership which could not be supported "by express precept or approved precedent," taken from the word of God, and applied in its proper contextual limitations. The follower of the dear Lord was not to be judged on account of his opinions on questions of "doubtful disputation." He recognized the right of untrammelled inquiry, but maintained a broad difference between the gospel of Jesus Christ, having for its content the way of salvation, and the uncertain deductions which constitute the formulas of systematic theology in all the widely conflicting schools. What Christ has bound upon the human soul, in order to its salvation, must be loosed by no human hand. But this binding is either in express precept or good and valid precedent. A condition of salvation is never an inference. The *facts* about Christ, the faith in Christ, the obedience to Christ, the blessings and franchises enjoyed through Christ—these are the topics of the gospel of redemption. He allowed to theory its proper place, as the attempt of the human mind to explain rationally the facts and commandments of the gospel, but he sternly denied the right of any disciple to force his personal explanation on the conscience of another. It was a characteristic utterance, when he once affirmed, "God never saved a man for believing a theory, or damned a man for disbelieving one." In the field of religious philosophy the soul is free, but this Christian

freedom is not to run into license in speculation, any more than in the corresponding department of conduct or life. It is easy to darken counsel by words without knowledge. Unbridled speculation is, and always has been, an evil of great magnitude in the church of God. We are indeed free to think, but wisdom in the expression of our thought is a true test of usefulness in a disciple of Jesus Christ. So one may theorize—for how can a thinking man keep quite clear of theory?—but his theories are mainly for himself, and must not be bound on other people as a test of fellowship, or membership in a Christian church. These fundamental distinctions were made clear in the early years of our reformatory movement, and its whole subsequent history has been shaped by their influence.

It is plain, then, that Mr. Campbell never thought of founding a community to reflect and perpetuate his own theological opinions. He fastened his opinions upon no one, in any way. In the department of opinion, of theology, he left every man as free as Christ had left him, and bravely insisted that none should be permitted to destroy or abridge that freedom. When he rested from his labors, there was not a single individual, or church, on earth, in any wise pledged to any theory or interpretation which he had held and promulgated by word or pen. The Disciples, his brethren, acknowledged and do acknowledge no

leader, in the sense of the above-quoted motto, but the Lord Messiah. They have never been pledged to anything but the revealed truth of God, as each single soul finds it for himself, through whatever helping instrumentalities, in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Truth only has authority. Truth is eternal reality, as God sees it, in the kingdom of the Spirit. The soul of man is bound to this truth, and to nought besides. It is bound to the Holy Scriptures because they contain this truth. It is bound to Christ, who is the truth, and to his word, whether spoken by himself or others as the expression of that truth for the authoritative direction of human life. That which is the substance and essence of Christianity, the facts concerning Christ, the sincere and intelligent belief of these facts, the reverent trust in Christ superinduced through this belief, the new life of the soul divinely inbreathed by means of this belief and trust, the expression of this life in all piety Godward, and in all philanthropy manward—these are the things to which we are committed as a religious community, because these are the things bound upon us by the Head of the church, our Savior and Lord. To demand more than this, is to become a sect; to demand less, is to cease to be Christian. So understand the matter all the Disciples of Christ, and so have they ever understood it from Alexander Campbell down to him whose pen traces these

words. In these things, our indebtedness to Mr. Campbell, under God, is very great, and is most cheerfully acknowledged. Further than these things we are not bound.

Mr. Campbell was a voluminous writer, but as editor of a religious periodical, rather than a maker of books. He became an editor early in his public career. His conception of the Christian religion was a growth. Like every other reformer, in cutting loose from the prescriptions of accepted creeds, he had to trace anew the great lines of Christian truth for himself. He says of his progress, that it "was gradual as the dawn." The great outlines, once distinctly grasped, had to be wrought out in detail patiently. What he thought and said at one time was not always strictly consistent with what he said at another. It is not a pleasant thing to confess one's mistakes, and though Mr. Campbell never, so far as the writer knows, said of any particular sentence he had written; "This was a mistake;" yet he revised his work so often, and surveyed the questions concerning which he wrote, from so many different points of view, that it is easy enough now to separate his mature and final utterances from those which were tentative, and intended to be accepted as provisional in their character. For instance, Mr. C. said some things in the *Christian Baptist* against Missionary, and even Bible Societies, which, at a later period, we positively

know he would not have said. In his celebrated Extras on remission and regeneration, he expressed his views incautiously, and so as to do himself injustice, even if we grant that the position he intended to maintain was, for substance, the true one. So, also, in the dialogue of Timothy and Austin on the work of the Holy Spirit, he exposed himself not only to misrepresentation but even to honest misapprehension upon the part of many persons by whom he sincerely desired to be correctly understood. It seems only the part of candor to say these things now, when the battle is over, and the smoke of the conflict passing away.

But one can have little patience with the wholesale misrepresentations which, in certain quarters, arose over these matters, and the obstinate unwillingness to be set right in regard to them, which was long persisted in by many fairly good men. If it can not be set down to the account of inevitable human weakness, then no excuse can be made for it.

But the point is this: No man among the Disciples is in any wise bound to defend any position of Mr. Campbell's which he may honestly regard as untenable. Nor are our children trained in catechisms which imply their correctness, and so forestall the honest, independent judgment, to which their own investigations might lead them in their maturer years. We have no articles of faith shaped for us by Mr. Campbell, or any other unin-

spired man. And as a matter of fact, there is not one of us who does not exercise the freedom, which is our heritage, to the fullest extent which sincere and reverent personal investigation may seem to demand. Our relation to Mr. Campbell, and our other great men, is not at all that of the Lutheran Church to Luther, of the Calvinian churches to Calvin, or of the Methodist churches to John Wesley. This fact is now plain beyond honest—shall I say?—denial. Hence, it concerns us not in the least to know from whom Mr. Campbell may have learned this or that item in his theological system, or whether Sandeman and M'Lean were the real founders of the movement, which, in this country, has been generally connected with his name by those who oppose it. Our only concern is to know if it is, primarily, from God. If so we are satisfied. Short of this there is no resting-place to us; beyond this we have not the least wish to go.

And yet, as we understand it, our obligations to Mr. Campbell are such that his good name is a matter of some concern to us. We owe him, under God, as we feel, a great debt, and we should not be true to our manhood, if we failed to repel the unfounded assertions of any one who seeks to darken with dishonor his grand life. Some one once said, "How can you reply to a sneer?" Ah! indeed! that has been my only difficuly in this review. Prof. Whitsitt's words of criticism and

argument have been easily met. But there is more in his book—or I am much mistaken—than the words which convey his strictures upon Mr. Campbell and the Disciples. There is the outbreathing of a spirit, the effluence of a personality —not an "aureole," for that is from without, and suggests saintly sanctity, but an efflux, an emanation, which comes from within, and reveals the moods of the soul which sends it forth; and this is what has been hard to reply to in a way to realize my ideal of what a review should be. I have sincerely desired to be just. I should scorn to impute motives, in any case, less worthy than the real ones. But I have been unable in reading Prof. Whitsitt's little volume to escape this malodorous presence for many moments together. The bitter curl of the author's lip, the sardonic smile, the alternating scowl, "the slow-moving" index finger—these have kept themselves constantly before my mind's eye. If I have spoken any word "unadvisedly," if any expression stronger than truth required has at any time escaped me, then this sinister, impalpable "geist," which has constantly confronted me with its presence, is altogether to blame for it.

But I must repeat the fact that the Disciples are in no wise bound to any of Mr. Campbell's opinions, interpretations, or reasonings. Neither does our respect for him sensibly influence us in our search for truth in the Word of God. Our only

quest is truth. Our practical aim is the glory of God. In the spirit of true disciples of the Master, we would seek the enlightenment and salvation of men. In all these things we are precisely as free as we should have been if Mr. Campbell had never lived. In a sense, Mr. Campbell was a great leader in our movement, but he has done what no other reformer ever did, he has left us our whole freedom in Christ, nay, he has eloquently and earnestly besought us to maintain this freedom, steadfast to the end. Our fealty is due to Christ. And if, in the progress of knowledge, the pursuit of truth should lead us quite away from some of the chief land-marks of our early history, there is nothing under heaven to hold us back. We are pledged only to the faith in Christ which saves the soul, and that expression of this faith in the life, which makes salvation an assured possession, according to the word of our God. We can not forsake this and be Christian; we can not add to this, as a test of membership, without making ourselves another sect, among sects, and so forfeiting our birthright, as restorers of the original gospel.

With our Baptist brethren we have no unchristian quarrel. If they fail to see the ineffable dignity of our distinctive position, we are sorry enough that it is so, but we shall not, I trust, foolishly abuse them for it. They will see it in the Lord's own good time. It is as true now as it ever

was, that only they can come to Christ, or to larger measures of the truth of Christ, who are drawn by the Father, and come because they are drawn. We earnestly desire to live in kindliest relations with the Baptists of all schools, and will so live, if they will only let us. But let them not delude themselves as to the reason that impels us to seek pleasant relations with them. We care as little for their indorsement as they can possibly care for ours. We know that we have the advantage of them before earth and heaven. We have moved on before them, in the grand march of human souls away from the superstitions and fantasies which yet survive the long spiritual night of the world, in which they had their birth. As men disengage themselves, more and more, from these unhappy survivals, the growth and power of our movement is bound to increase. If God so wills, we can afford to wait for the better day which is sure to come. And we can do without anybody's recognition, meantime, that gives it not at all, or only grudgingly. But our broad, divine plea compels us to hold our arms open for brotherhood and fellowship with those who sincerely love and serve our Lord, whether they see very clearly the genius of the common faith or not. It is not for us, who providentially occupy the vanguard of the Lord's moving hosts, to withhold our love from those who would fall into line with us, if they only saw clearly that they ought to do it. To

speak boldly the truth which God has given us in charge, and to lovingly and patiently wait for its final triumph is our bounden duty. The blessing of the Lord God Almighty upon every soul that sincerely loves Jesus and seeks to follow in his footsteps.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

The following extracts from an article by Dr. Henry C. Vedder, published in the number for July, 1888, of the *Baptist Quarterly Review*, will be a read with interest, as an expression of Baptist opinion:

"Dr. Whitsitt begins by stating his thesis as follows: 'The Disciples of Christ, commonly called Campbellites from the name of their founder, Mr. Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, West Virginia, are an offshoot of the Sandemanian sect of Scotland.' The value of this study of the sources from which the peculiar tenets and customs of the Disciples were drawn, so far as they were drawn mediately from other Christians and not immediately from the Scriptures, does not depend in the least upon the establishment of this proposition. This is fortunate, for it does not seem that the author has proved his thesis."

* * * * * * * * *

"In the first place, the term 'offshoot' in Dr. Whitsitt's thesis does not seem to be very fortunately chosen. It seems to imply" (does it not unqualifiedly and absolutely imply?) "that there

was an organic connection between the Sandemanian sect and the Disciples. This is by no means the case."

"Thomas Campbell came to this country in 1807, a minister of the Seceders' Church, in full fellowship. Alexander Campbell, up to the time of his leaving Scotland, was also in full fellowship with this body, although in heart he had ceased to hold its doctrines, or to sympathize with its practice. He had spent some time, while a student at the University of Glasgow, in the society of Greville Ewing, one of the leaders of the Sandemanian sect, and had been strongly influenced by the peculiar notions of this able and eccentric divine. Many of these notions were afterwards worked out in the Reformation. *His obligations to Ewing, and to the writings of Glas and Sandeman, Alexander Campbell never denied or concealed.* He did not profess that his teachings were original. He only claimed that they were true. 'I am,' said he, 'greatly indebted to all the reformers, from Martin Luther down to John Wesley. I could not enumerate or particularize the individuals, living and dead, who have assisted in forming my mind. If all the Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Persian, French, English, Irish, Scotch, and American teachers and authors were to demand their own from me, I do not know that I would have two mites to buy incense to

offer upon the altar to my genius of originality for the honors vouchsafed me.'

* * * * * * * * *

"This brief outline of facts is sufficient to show that, so far from being an 'offshoot' of the Sandemanian sect of Scotland, the Disciples are so far as any organic connection is concerned, an off shoot of the Baptist denomination of the United States. It might easily be shown, of course, that Alexander Campbell and his followers were nothing more than nominal Baptists. From the beginning they were never in sympathy with the views of truth that prevail among Baptist churches, but the fact is indisputable that they were in organic union with the Baptists until that union was dissolved by the Baptist associations and Baptist churches withdrawing fellowship from them.

"The utmost, then, that Dr. Whitsitt's thesis can mean is, that in spirit, in doctrine and in church order the Disciples have drawn more largely from the Sandemanians than from any other body of Christians.

* * * * * * * * *

"In Chapter II, of his little book he gives fifteen particulars of Sandemanian doctrines and practices, as follows:

"1. *A plurality of elders in each church.*

"2. *A weekly observance of the Lord's Supper.*

"3. The supporting of themselves by the

elders in some trade or profession outside of the ministry.

"4. The observance of love feasts such as prevailed in the early Christian Church.

"5. The kiss of charity as enjoined in the apostolic letters.

"6. Feet-washing as a church ordinance.

"7. Abstinence from eating blood.

"8. The necessity of absolute unanimity on the part of the various members in every transaction by an individual church.

"9. A modified communism, the personal estate of each communicant being always subject to the demand of the necessitous, especially those of the household of faith.

"10. *The calling of the weekly collection the fellowship.*

"11. THE CUSTOM OF MUTUAL EXHORTATION AS A REGULAR PART OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

"12. Non-practice of family worship.

"13. The absence of scruples against going to the theatre, or joining in the dance, or other social amusements with any, even with irreligious people.

"14. THE EXCLUSION OF ALL BUT COMMUNICANTS FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICES OF THE CHURCH.

"15. *The refusal to regard the first day of the week as a Sabbath, or to even call it by that name.*

"Dr. Whitsitt compares those peculiarities with

the teachings of Mr. Campbell and the practice of the Disciples at the present time, with this curious result: Of the fifteen particulars enumerated, the Disciples agree with the Sandemanians in the four printed in italics, viz., numbers 1, 2, 10 and 15. The Disciples absolutely disagree with the Sandemanians in the nine particulars printed in ordinary type, viz., numbers 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 13; and two cases printed in small capitals (11 and 14) are doubtful. *Ergo*, the Disciples are an 'offshoot' of the Sandemanians!

* * * * * * * *

"But Dr. Whitsitt, in spite of his own confessions to the contrary, and in spite of facts that cannot be denied, persists in calling the Scotch Baptists, Sandemanians—'the immersed wing of the Sandemanian fraternity,' and again, 'the immersed Sandemanians,' and similar titles. The more reasonable ground would seem to be that, after he severed his relations with the Sandemanian church at Glasgow, Archibald M'Lean was no more a Sandemanian than Adoniram Judson continued to be a Congregationalist, after he was baptized at Calcutta. It is necessary, however, for Dr. Whitsitt to maintain his views of M'Lean's continued connection with the Sandemanians, because otherwise his thesis utterly falls to the ground. The main ideas in Alexander Campbell's Reformation were, as he believes, borrowed from M'Lean, especially the distinctive and peculiar

doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins; but M'Lean was, it seems plain, a Baptist when he wrote his *Commission of Christ*. Dr. Whitsitt's thesis as to the origin of the Disciples is in the predicament of Humpty Dumpty."

* * * * * * * *

"What Dr. Whitsitt calls the second stage of Mr. Campbell's perversion to Sandemanianism was the adoption of the views afterward advocated by him with regard to baptism. It seems that in the church at Brush Run, one of the most influential members, Joseph Bryant, was in favor of immersion. It became necessary, says Dr. Whitsitt, in order to secure his support and to prevent the church from going to pieces, that this question should be definitely decided:

"'He therefore resolved to take the step which it was becoming evident the larger portion of the church demanded at the hands of himself and his father. Accordingly he made preparations to procure his own immersion. When he went to communicate his intention to his father, an ally was found in the house in the person of his sister Dorothea. Naturally concerned to avoid an explosion in the church, by means of which she might be required to decide between the affection she bore her parents and her affection for the man to whom she was, perhaps, already betrothed, she had become, like Mr. Bryant, a decided advocate of immersion. If Mr. Bryant, and the majority

of the little church at Brush Run, could have been induced to tolerate aspersion, it is probable that the Campbells would never have found it convenient to leave the side of the sprinkling Sandemanians.'

"This is our author's account of a change, by all means the most important that ever occurred in the belief and practice of Alexander Campbell —a change that he always insisted was due to his conscientious convictions, growing out of an independent study of the Scriptures. Two of the least creditable motives that could possibly actuate a man in the matter of a religious conversion, are attributed in this account to Mr. Campbell: That he professed a change of convictions with reference to baptism, first, in order to retain the support of influential members of his church, and, second, to make sure of an eligible suitor for his sister's hand. To justify such accusations against the motives of any reputable Christian man, the strongest evidence ought to be produced. In favor of the first, Dr. Whitsitt produces only the fact that some members of the church strongly favored immersion. In favor of the second he has nothing better than a "perhaps." There is no evidence that Mr. Bryant was a suitor for Dorothea Campbell's hand before her baptism, and certainly none that, if he was a suitor, either of the Campbells was influenced by that fact.

* * * * * * * *

"But this is not all. Dr. Whitsitt gives us also an account, entirely original with him, of Alexander Campbell's change of views with regard to the subjects of baptism. It has already been disproved by the summary given from Mr. Richardson's narrative; but it is worth while to quote it, to show how completely the facts have been misinterpreted:

"'On the 13th of March, 1812, his first child was born. The question of infant baptism, therefore, became to him a topic of special interest. Doubtless with reference to the scruples of James Foster, he had formerly urged that this point should be treated as a matter of forbearance. That was the utmost limit to which he might safely advance if he desired to obtain the sympathy and support of so important a personage. It does not appear that he ventured as far as that since the 5th of June, 1811, possibly abstaining through fear of promoting an undesirable conflict. If now he had dared to baptize his child, after its birth in March, 1812, he must have done so with the conviction that the act would cost him the affections and countenance of most of the communicants at Brush Run. At any rate, he could not make up his mind to provoke the church in that way; and contrary to the position of Greville Ewing, his child was compelled to dispense with baptism.'

"The mention of James Foster's scruples is entirely gratuitous, for it was the fundamental posi-

tion of the church at Brush Run from its organization, that the question of infant baptism was a 'matter of indifference.' There is not a circumstance in the whole of Alexander Campbell's life that gives the slightest warrant for the imputation against his courage. It would be difficult to name the other man in the history of modern Christianity who has shown a greater intrepidity, a more utter disregard of the opinions and prejudices of other men, a more unflinching determination to follow whithersoever his convictions pointed the way, than Alexander Campbell. Baptists believe that he was often in the wrong, but he was never a coward.

"Dr. Jeter, one of his most active contemporary opponents, does him justice, when he says, 'About this time (1811), he was led to question the divine authority of infant sprinkling, and, after a long, serious, and prayerful examination of all the sources of information within his reach, to reject it and to solicit immersion on a profession of faith.' This is doubtless the exact truth, and the testimony is of the higher value, as it came from one who was, through most of his life, a vigorous opponent of Mr. Campbell's teachings.

"It is with the utmost regret that these strictures are made upon Dr. Whitsitt's book. All of the present writer's prepossessions were in its favor, and it would have been a much more pleasant task to commend without qualification, than to

dispute the statements of so eminent a scholar of our denomination. But the accomplished author would be the first to assert that truth is the highest of all considerations, and solely to help establish the truth these criticisms are made.

New York. HENRY C. VEDDER."

NOTE B.

The following paragraphs are taken from a Review in the *New York Examiner* (Baptist paper), of May 17, 1888. The writer shows clearly his Baptist sympathies, but evidently means to do justice. From a Baptist, this review is very significant:

"Neither Alexander Campbell nor Thomas Campbell was ever a member of the Sandemanian sect. Both were, up to the time of their leaving Scotland, members of the Seceder Church, now known as the United Presbyterian Church. It is true that while at Glasgow University Alexander Campbell had been brought in contact with the Sandemanians, and had even imbibed some of their peculiar notions, which were worked out in his 'Reformation,' but a Sandemanian he never was. The Disciples are not an 'offshoot' of the Sandemanians in any such sense as the Methodists may be called an offshoot of the Church of England. The connection between them, such as it is, is limited to spirit and doctrine. So far as out-

ward and organic connection is concerned, the Disciples might much more plausibly be held to be an offshoot of the Baptist denomination."

This reviewer then proceeds to state what he regards as the extent of Mr. Campbell's indebtedness to Sandeman. Concerning the points mentioned he adds the following:

"These are the principal items that Mr. Campbell derived from the Sandemanians. None of them, excepting perhaps the first, is fundamental, as will readily be seen. The fundamental principles of the Disciple faith and practice, so far as they were borrowed, were derived from another source."

Then he proceeds to administer a merited rebuke to Dr. W. for his illiberal and unjust treatment of the Scotch Baptists, as follows:

"These he persists, in spite of proofs furnished in his own pages to the contrary, in calling 'the immersed wing of the Sandemanian fraternity,' 'the immersed Sandemanians,' and the like. Now it is quite true that at one time Robert Carmichael and Archibald M'Lean, the leaders of the Scotch Baptists, were connected with the Sandemanian persuasion. But both left the sect, Mr. Carmichael resigning the pastorate of the Sandemanian church in Glasgow, and Mr. M'Lean retiring from membership at the same time. 'After this pair of friends had fallen into a condition of separation from the Sandemanians,' to use Dr.

Whitsitt's own words, he continues to call them Sandemanians; and this, too, after they had come to adopt believers' baptism, and had been themselves immersed on profession of their faith. That they no longer regarded themselves as Sandemanians, that the Sandemanians denounced them as Anabaptists, is no barrier to our author's fixed purpose that they shall be Sandemanians; and Sandemanians he calls them to the end. In our judgment this is not historical criticism, it is not fair treatment of the facts."

The following extract is specially noteworthy, but only what simple honesty required at the reviewer's hands:

"The account given in chapter VIII. of Mr. Campbell's adoption of immersion as baptism and rejection of infant baptism is greatly to be regretted. There is no good reason—certainly Dr. Whitsitt produces none—to doubt the statement of Mr. Campbell's biographer that this step was taken after protracted study of the Scriptures, and much heart-searching on the part of both the Campbells. Professor Richardson gives a long and circumstantial narrative of the causes that led to this action, and unless that narrative is an entire fabrication, the imputations of unworthy motives made by Dr. Whitsitt have no foundation of fact, and should be expunged from his book."

It was natural that a Baptist reviewer should find in a book like Dr. Whitsitt's some things to

be commended. These are duly noted, and at least as much credit given as is deserved. It is enough that this distinguished Baptist says that Prof. Whitsitt has not proved his main thesis—that which his book was meant to prove; and that an important section of it ought in justice to the truth of history to be expunged. The Disciples need ask no more.

Courtesy of

Nebraska Christian College Library

Courtesy of